'The manner of life of Anselm, a man beloved of God': Saint Anselm's legacy in historical and hagiographical writing connected to Christ Church, Canterbury and the abbey of Bec c.1080- c.1140

BRITTON, STEPHANIE,CAROLINE

'The manner of life of Anselm, a man beloved of God': Saint Anselm's legacy in historical and hagiographical writing connected to Christ Church, Canterbury and the abbey of Bec c.1080- c.1140

Stephanie Britton

This thesis explores Saint Anselm's legacy in the writing of hagiography and history by authors connected to Le Bec monastery and Christ Church, Canterbury, c.1080 -c.1140.

Anselm was a prominent monastic and ecclesiastical figure in England and Normandy. In addition, he produced a number of significant meditational and theological texts. The impact of his life and influence has previously been seen almost exclusively within the sphere of contemporary and later theological writing.

This thesis will argue that there was a circle of authors, largely connected to the Christ Church, Canterbury and Le Bec monasteries, who were actively incorporating Anselmian themes into their recording of historic and contemporary events. These incorporations generally took the form of the re-envisioning of characters in Anselm's image and the insertion of themes from Anselm's theological thought into the narratives of these texts. This study will examine how these authors shaped Anselm's legacy in their texts and the degree to which these constructions were influenced by Anselm.

The conclusions of this study will highlight the potential for prominent figures to have a strong impact on the recording of contemporary and historic events in this period.

‘The manner of life of Anselm, a man beloved of God’: Saint Anselm’s legacy in historical and hagiographical writing connected to Christ Church, Canterbury and the abbey of Bec c.1080- c.1140

Stephanie Britton

Submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History

Department of History, Durham University

2017

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations

ANS	*Anglo-Norman Studies*, Proceedings of the Battle Conference
De libertate	'De libertate Beccensis monasterii', in *Three Treatises from Bec on the Nature of Monastic Life*, ed. G. Constable and trans. B. S. Smith (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), pp. 136-69
Ep.	*Epistola*
Epp.	*Epistolae*
Gilbert, *VH*	Gilbert Crispin, 'Vita Herluini', in *The Works of Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster,* eds. A. Sapir Abulafia & G. R. Evans (London: British Academy, 1986), pp. 182-212
GPA	William of Malmesbury, *Gesta pontificum Anglorum: the history of the English bishops*, ed. and trans. M. Winterbottom (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007)
Eadmer, *Historia*	Eadmer of Canterbury, *Eadmeri Historia Novorum in Anglia et opuscula duo de vita Sancti Anselmi et quibusdam miraculis ejus*, ed. M. Rule (London: Longman, 1884)
HN	Eadmer of Canterbury, *History of recent events in England*, trans. G. Bosanquet (London: Cresset Press, 1964)
Osbern, *VA*	Osbern of Canterbury, 'Vita Alfege' in *Anglia sacra, sive Collectio historiarum, partim antiquitus, partim recenter scriptarum, de archiepiscopis & episcopis Angliae, a prima fidei Christianae susceptione ad annum MDXL*, ed. H. Wharton, 2 vols (London: Gregg Publishing, 1691), vol. 1, pp. 122-147
Osbern, *VD*	Osbern of Canterbury, 'Vita Dunstani', in *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs (London: Longman, 1874), pp. 69-161
Migne, *PL*	*Patrologia Latina*, ed. J. P. Migne, 221 vols (Paris: Imprimerie Catholique, 1841-55)
Southern, *Biographer*	R. W. Southern, *Saint Anselm and his biographer: a study of monastic life and thought, c.1059- c.1130* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963)

Southern, *Portrait*	R. W. Southern, *Saint Anselm: a portrait in a landscape* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990)
VA	Eadmer of Canterbury, *Vita Anselmi*, ed. and trans. R. W. Southern (London: Nelson, 1962)
VD	Eadmer of Canterbury, 'Vita Dunstani', in *Lives and miracles of Saints Oda, Dunstan and Oswald,* eds. and trans. A. J. Turner & B. J. Muir (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006), pp. 41-212
Vita Alfege	Osbern of Canterbury, *Vita Alfege*, trans. F. Shaw (London: St. Paul's Publishing, 1999)
VO	Eadmer of Canterbury, 'Vita Oswaldi', in *Lives and miracles of Saints Oda, Dunstan and Oswald,* eds. and trans. A. J. Turner & B. J. Muir (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006), pp. 213-324
VOO	Eadmer of Canterbury, 'Vita Odonis', in *Lives and miracles of Saints Oda, Dunstan and Oswald,* eds. and trans. A. J. Turner & B. J. Muir (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006), pp. 1-40
VW	Eadmer of Canterbury, *Vita Wilfridi*, eds. and trans. A. J. Turner & B. J. Muir (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1998)

This thesis uses *S. Anselmi cantuariensis archiepiscopi opera omnia*, 6 vols, ed. by F. S. Schmitt (Edinburgh: Nelson, 1946–1961) of Anselm's works and letters in Latin for all quotations.

English translations for the letters are from *The letters of Saint Anselm of Canterbury*, 3 vols, trans. W. Fröhlich (Kalamazoo, Michigan: Cistercian Publications, 1990-4), with emendations where necessary.

English translations of Anselm's treatises are from *Complete philosophical and theological treaties of Anselm of Canterbury*, trans. J. Hopkins and H. Richardson (Minneapolis: The Arthur J. Banning Press, 2000).

All biblical references are to Douay-Rheims Bible in the Latin Vulgate, as accessed at: www.drbo.org.

Acknowledgements

Dr Giles E. M. Gasper of the Durham University Department of History and Institute of Medieval and Early Modern Studies has been invaluable in his role as my primary supervisor. I have benefitted from his expertise and teaching throughout the course of my postgraduate studies. I would also like to express my thanks to Dr Helen Foxhall Forbes, my second supervisor, for her support and kindness. Prof Sally Vaughn and Dr Sigbjørn Sønnesyn have both offered useful biographical help in support of my research.

Finally, I would like to thank the Arts and Humanities Research Council for funding this thesis. The dissemination of this project at international conferences has been made possible by further financial assistance from the Durham University Department of History, the Institute of Medieval and Early Modern Studies, Pembroke College (University of Oxford) and Boston College, Massachusetts.

Introduction

This thesis investigates the incorporation of Anselm of Canterbury's theological and meditational thought into the record of historical and contemporary events in the late eleventh and early twelfth century. The aim of this study is to demonstrate that a network of Benedictine monks, primarily operating from the abbey of Bec and Christ Church, Canterbury mediated Anselm's teachings on the nature of the world and humanity through their writings on hagiography and history. This group of authors were active during Anselm's life and up to several decades after his death.[1] The use of Anselmian themes in this corpus reveals the immediate impact of Anselm's life and writings upon one group of scholars who were writing in genres other than what would now be termed theology.

The presence of contemporary conceptions of appropriate human behaviour and theological models in these texts reveals the potential impact that prominent thinkers could have on the writing of history and related genres. In this case, Anselm's prolific literary output of letters, meditational and theological tracts does not include any historical or hagiographical works, yet his ideas were adopted and integrated into the texts of notable contemporary historians and hagiographers. The cross-genre influence of theological writing on the recording of historic and contemporary events and figures represents a lively interaction between scholars of different disciplines, which are sometimes seen as operating in relative exclusion from one another.

Medieval historical and hagiographical texts were constructed and read principally for their presentation of ideal (and non-ideal) human behaviour, *exempla* upon which readers could model their own behaviour.[2] The presence of Anselmian themes in other authors'

[1] The earliest text, Osbern of Canterbury's *Vita Alfege*, can be dated to c.1080. *Vita Alfege*, p. 10. The latest group of texts have been loosely dated to c.1136-1150. A. Collins, *Teacher in Faith and Virtue: Lanfranc of Bec's commentary on St. Paul* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), p. 6.

[2] The traditional indifference to medieval authors' claims to be creating pedagogical works has recently been reassessed by Sigbjørn Sønnesyn, who created a convincing argument that these claims were genuine. S. Sønnesyn, *William of Malmesbury and the Ethics of History* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2012). This original work focussed on William of Malmesbury's historical writing, but has also been extended to the writing of Orderic Vitalis. S. Sønnesyn, '*Studiosi abdita investigant*': Orderic Vitalis and the Mystical Morals of History', in

works, particularly those written by his friends and students suggests different ways in which Anselm's teachings reached a wider audience through non-theological texts.[3] The particular significance of Anselmian thought in historical and hagiographical texts written at Canterbury and Bec serves to indicate the extent to which Anselm influenced these communities' conceptions of ideal monastic characters, and how these texts, as Eadmer puts it, describe 'the manner of life of Anselm, a man beloved of God'.[4]

This study will not investigate Anselm's influence on contemporary theological writing. Primarily, this exclusion operates because of considerable scholarly work which has been produced on this topic, particularly in recent years. Modern scholars have looked at the influence of Anselm's writing on theological works composed by a variety of authors such as Gilbert Crispin, Ralph of Battle, Honorius Augustodunensis, Odo of Cambrai, Anselm of Laon and Eadmer of Canterbury.[5] These studies have explored how contemporary theologians

Orderic Vitalis: life, works and interpretations, eds. C. C Rozier, D. Roach, G. E. M. Gasper & E. M. C. van Houts (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2016).

[3] Richard Southern's surveys of Anselm's students restricted Anselm's 'pupils' to other theologians and to those who collected Anselm's sermons. The use of Anselm's ideas in the works of authors of non-theological texts may identify another circle of Anselm's pupils. For Southern on Anselm's students: Southern, *Portrait*, pp. 371-381. See also: R. W. Southern, 'St. Anselm and his English pupils,' *Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 1 (1941), pp. 3-34. In this article, Southern does discuss Anselm's influence on Eadmer, but only in relation to Eadmer's theological texts.

[4] *VA*, *Miracula*, Prologue: ut qui qualem vitam vir Deo amabilis Anselmus duxerit.

[5] See scholarship, in general: B. Goebel, *Im Umkreis von Anselm: Biographisch-bibliographische Porträts von Autoren aus Le Bec und Canterbury* (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 2017); Southern, *Portrait*, pp. 371-381. Southern, 'St. Anselm and his English pupils'. G. R. Evans, Anselm's life, works and immediate influence', in *The Cambridge Companion to Anselm*, eds. B. Davies and B. Leftow (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 5-31. Specific to authors, for Ralph of Battle see: B. Goebel, S. Niskanen & S. Sønneyson, *Ralph von Battle: Dialoge zur philosophischen Theologie* (Feiburg: Verlag Herder, 2015). For Odo of Cambrai, see: T. D. Hughes, 'Odo of Tournai, Scholar and Holy man', unpublished DPhil thesis (University of Oxford, 2000). For Honorius Augustodunensis: V. I. J. Flint, 'The Sources of the 'Elucidarius' of Honorius Augustodunensis,' *Revue Benedictine* 85 (1975): pp. 190-98. For Eadmer, see: K. Ihnat, *Mother of Mary, Bane of the Jews: Devotion to the Virgin Mary in Anglo-Norman England* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016). For Anselm of Laon, see: C. Giraud, *Per verba magistri. Anselme de Laon et son ecole au XII siècle* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010). For Gilbert Crispin, see: R. W. Southern, 'St. Anselm and Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster,' *Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 3 (1954), pp. 78-115. Gilbert Crispin, *The Works of Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster*,

were affected by Anselm's theological ideas and writing style. By comparison, the potential impact of Anselm's writing on contemporary historical and hagiographical writing has been, curiously, overlooked.

This study will take a narrow definition of 'Anselmian' texts when demonstrating the incorporation of Anselmian thought, and will prefer not use reports of Anselm's words by secondary authors. Specifically, two important texts, the contemporary *Anselmus de monte humilitatis* and the later *Liber de Similitudinibus* will not be used.[6] The *Anselmus de monte humilitatis* is a collection of twenty-one sermons or fragments compiled by Anselm's friend Alexander. An anonymous compiler created the *Liber de Similitudinibus*, a collection of Anselm's saying which was created at an uncertain date after Anselm's death, and was popular in the west of England, but not at Canterbury. The earliest Canterbury manuscript dates from the thirteenth century. Richard Southern established that these texts may represent memories of Anselm's sermons and sayings. However, Southern also commented on the differences between these texts and, for example, Eadmer's own, explaining the variants as a product of the particular authors' individual theological understanding and expression.

A modern scholar is hardly bereft of works that were written by Anselm: there are a number of theological treatises, a collection of four-hundred-and-seventy-five letters, the vast majority written by Anselm, and a collection of prayers and meditations.[7] In this study,

---

eds. A. Sapir Abulafia and G. R. Evans (London: British Academy, 1986), pp. xxi-xl. A. Sapir Abulafia, 'An attempt by Gilbert Crispin, abbot of Westminster at a rational argument in the Jewish-Christian debate', *Studia Monastica*, vol. xxvi (1984), pp. 55-74. A. Sapir Abulafia, 'Jewish-Christian disputations and the twelfth-century renaissance' *Journal of Medieval History* 15:2 (1989), pp. 105-125. In addition, Southern has written on the influence of Anselm's ideas on the works of Elmer, prior of Christ Church, and Rodulfus. See: Southern, *Biographer*, pp. 205-217 and Southern, 'St. Anselm and his English pupils'.

[6] See a survey, Southern, *Biographer*, pp. 220-222. Also discussed in Southern, 'St. Anselm and his English pupils', pp. 7-10.

[7] There is a considerable amount of discussion regarding the extent of Anselm's involvement in compiling the letter collection. Schmitt concluded that this collection was compiled under the direction of Anselm, see: F. S. Schmitt, *S. Anselmi cantuariensis archiepiscopi opera omnia*, vol. 1, pp. 234-239, also, F. S. Schmitt, 'Die unter Anselm veranstaltete Ausgabe seiner Werke und Briefe: die Codices Bodley 271 und Lambeth 59,' *Scriptorum* 9 (1955), pp. 64-75. However, Southern argued that the near-contemporary collection of Anselm's letters, the 'L'

where Eadmer's *Vita Anselmi* is used to demonstrate Anselm's behaviour or educational methods, this is supported where necessary by evidence from Anselm's letter collection. Works which were written after Anselm's death represent a separate era, as the incorporation of Anselm's ideas into these later works was facilitated by Eadmer's *Vita Anselmi*.

In this study, Anselm's scholarly texts will be referred to as 'theological', although this is not, strictly speaking, a term widely used in Anselm's lifetime.[8] Scholars working in the field of Anselm studies use both theology and philosophy to denote this field, and the preferred term is inconsequential to the argument in this thesis. The differing ways in which Anselmian ideas were incorporated by the authors to be considered below means that finding one simple methodology to assess the influence of Anselm's writing is distorting of the individuals' intentions. This thesis takes different approaches to different texts, depending on the nature of the authors' uses of Anselmian themes.

The subject of influence plays a significant role in this thesis and therefore, merits further discussion. There is a vast body of research which has examined the concept of 'influence', which, in general, has been studied in relation to literary studies and art history. This topic has attracted the interest of the scholarly community since the eighteenth century, but drew renewed attention in the second half of the twentieth century, eventually being

---

portion of the manuscript Lambeth MS 59, was only created after the archbishop's death – see, R. W. Southern, 'Sally Vaughn's Anselm: Examination of the foundations', *Albion* 20:2 (1988), pp. 181-204, at p. 203. He also objected in: Southern, *Biographer*, pp. 67-8. Southern, *Portrait*, pp. 459-82. Vaughn, Walter Fröhlich, Samu Niskanen and Eileen Sweeney have since challenged Southern's position, see: S. N. Vaughn, *Archbishop Anselm 1093-1109: Bec Missionary, Canterbury Primate, Patriarch of Another World* (Oxford: Ashgate Publishing, 2012), pp. 8-12. W. Fröhlich, 'Anselm's *Weltbild* as conveyed in his letters', *Anselm Studies* 2 (1988), pp. 483-525. *The Letters of Saint Anselm of Canterbury*, trans. W. Fröhlich, 3 vols. (Kalamazoo, Michigan: Cistercian Publications, 1990-4), vol. 1, pp. 35, 39-52. S. K. Niskanen, *The letter collections of Anselm of Canterbury*, Ph.D diss (Helsinki, 2009), pp. 161-67. Niskanen suggests that the 'L' manuscript did date from after Anselm's death, but was based on Anselm's own collection, now lost. Niskanen adds that Anselm 'surely censured' his own collection. E. Sweeney, *Anselm of Canterbury and the desire for the word* (Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2012), pp. 38-42.

[8] See discussion: G. E. M. Gasper, 'Theology at Le Bec', in *A companion to the abbey of Le Bec in the central middle ages (11th-13th centuries)*, eds. B. Pohl & L. L. Gathagan (Boston: Brill, 2018), pp. 206-227, at p. 207.

supplanted by the connected idea of 'intertextuality'.[9] There has been general agreement throughout scholarship that defining the term 'influence' is difficult, but that it can be understood as the movement (in a conscious or unconscious way) of an idea, a theme, an image, a literary tradition or even a tone from one author/text to a second.[10] The appearance of this idea, theme, etc, in the second text is reliant on the second author's contact with the first author or his/her texts.[11] Associated issues such as types of influence: literary versus non-literary, direct versus indirect, and reception and imitation have been studied in relation to the concept of influence. Intertextuality, by contrast, is defined as the relationship between texts, a definition which moved the emphasis away from individual authors, and towards texts.[12]

In general, this thesis does not engage in great depth with this discussion or attempt to follow some of the boundaries outlined by previous scholars who have worked in this field. This study prefers the older term 'influence' over 'intertextuality'. This is partly due to the varying nature of contact between the authors examined in this thesis. The term 'intertextuality' is not strictly applicable to all of the cases, as contact between these authors was frequently as much personal as literary. For example, Osbern of Canterbury's relationship

[9] For discussion of the issues surrounding influence and intertextuality, see: J. B. Clayton, *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History* (Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1991), especially part I: J. Clayton & E. Rothstein, 'Figures in the Corpus: Theories of Influence and Intertextuality', pp. 3-37. G. Hermeren, *Influence in Art and Literature* (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2005), see, esp. chapter 1. The most prominent scholars who directly addressed problems with influence were: M. Baxandall, *Patterns of Intention: On the historical explanation of Pictures* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1985) and H. Bloom, *The Anxiety of Poetry: A Theory of Poetry* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997).

[10] M. M. Enani & M. S. Farid, *The Comparative Tone; Essays in Comparative Literature with Special Reference to English Studies in Egypt, Translation and Culture* (Cario, State Publishing House, 1995), p. 15.

[11] A. Owen Aldridge, 'The Concept of Influence in Comparative Literature' in *Comparative Literature Studies* (Penn State University Press, 1963), pp. 143-152 at p. 144.

[12] This is a standard dictionary definition, but scholars in the field are not in agreement. Intertextuality is a relatively new term, coined by Julia Kristeva in the 1960s, who wrote that intertextuality is: 'tout texte se construit comme mosaïque de citations, tout texte est absorption et transformation d'un autre texte'. J. Kristeva, 'Le mot, le dialogue et le Roman' in *Sēmeiōtikē: Recherches pour une sémanalyse* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1969), pp. 143-173, at. p. 146. For a summary of the major contributors to this discussion, see: A. Graham, *Intertextuality* (London: Routledge, 2000).

with Anselm was primarily intimate in nature, as between master and student. Anselm's texts had a very limited influence on Osbern, as Osbern was writing at a time prior to the publication of the vast majority of Anselm's texts.[13] In a considerable number of examples examined in this thesis, Anselm's texts are used to show his influence on a second author's text(s) where the second author had probably never read the relevant Anselmian texts. In these cases, Anselm's texts are used to replace the figure of Anselm himself; the secondary texts are compiled partly from Anselm's texts, but also from moral lessons, personal experiences and even conversations with Anselm himself. Reducing these complex relationships as existing merely between texts may be misleading. This issue can be resolved by using the older term 'influence', which carries a broader meaning and can encompass the contact between authors and their texts.

There has been recent debate concerning the concept of influence, and of the problems with using the term in medieval studies, which is relevant to the discussion in this thesis. The 2007 edited collection *Under the influence: the concept of influence and the study of illuminated manuscripts* contains a number of articles which explore the complications of the concept of influence in the area of art history in the medieval period.[14] Most prominently, Micheal Baxandall's 1985 critique of the concept of influence is largely dismissed as being incompatible with the medieval era.[15] Baxandall had proposed the complete erasure of the concept of influence from the scholarly vocabulary. This proposition had rested on Baxandall's perception that the concept of influence implies that the 'influencer' would be the active agent in this process, thereby diminishing the role of the author subject to this influence.[16] Baxandall suggested that the reverse was more often the case:

[13] Towards the end of Osbern's life, he may have had access to some of Anselm's texts. See discussion in chapter four.

[14] *Under the influence: the concept of influence and the study of illuminated manuscripts*, eds. J. Lowden & A. Bovey (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007).

[15] See, A. Bovey, 'Introduction: Influence and Illumination' in *Under the influence*, p. xiii.

[16] M. Baxandall, *Patterns of Intention: On the historical explanation of Pictures* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1985), pp. 58-67.

> If one says that X influenced Y it does seem that one is saying that X did something to Y rather than Y did something to X. But in the consideration of good pictures and painters the second is always the more lively reality.[17]

The authors in *Under the influence* acknowledge that the implications of influence as spelled out by Baxandall are undesirable, but none concur with his proposal to reject the concept. One commentator, Michelle Brown, argues that Baxandall's interpretation of the concept of influence makes judgements about the artist's creative process, which, particularly in the medieval era, are largely speculative.[18] Alixe Bovey concludes that Baxandall's critique of influence be balanced against 'a tension between active volition and passive reception', drawing a fairly moderate assessment of the concept of influence.[19]

The treatment of the concept of influence in this thesis largely follows the interpretation of this recent scholarship. There is no doubt that the authors in this study were active agents, as many were writing after Anselm's death or even, in the case of Eadmer, against Anselm's will.[20] Further, these authors' incorporation of theological and meditational ideas into their historical and hagiographical texts sometimes represent slightly different interpretations from Anselm's own scholarship. The incorporations often appear as the author's particular understanding of Anselm's theology. Although this thesis finds a unifying theme in Anselm's thought, there is no intention to diminish the role of these second authors, who were active participants in the process. Finally, as Brown has noted, any attempt to speculate about whether the authors studied were actively or passively incorporating Anselm's thought may be hypothetical.

Scholarship

This thesis examines a number of works of history and hagiography written by Anglo-Norman Benedictine monks in the late-eleventh and early-twelfth centuries. The activity of

[17] Baxandall, *Patterns of Intention*, p. 59.

[18] M. P. Brown, 'An Early Medieval Outbreak of 'Influenza' in *Under the influence*, p. 4.

[19] Bovey, 'Introduction: Influence and Illumination' in *Under the influence*, p. xiii.

[20] *VA*, Book II, lxxii.

these authors reflects the wider context of the outpouring of monastic texts in this period, especially in the areas of history and hagiography. There has been a considerable amount of scholarship written investigating this movement, which occurred across a variety of genres, throughout Europe.[21] Prominent scholars such as Southern and Elisabeth van Houts, among others, have commented on the development within the sphere of historical writing.[22] The increase in the writing of history has generally been associated with the wider social, political and economic transformations of the twelfth century. This period was one in which Christendom was being transformed by the Gregorian and monastic reforms, which precipitated developments in intellectual and theological thinking.[23] Southern, in particular, viewed the proliferation of new texts as being closely related to the humanistic revival in twelfth-century Europe, and highlighted the role of Benedictine monks in the writing of history.[24] The rediscovery of Augustinian and other texts and the renewed focus on expanding the libraries at monasteries may have contributed to the increase in monastic-written texts, and to the new styles of writing. Scholars such as Richard Gameson, Teresa Webber and Rodney Thomson have highlighted the increased copying and exchange of

[21] This introduction focusses on the areas of history and hagiography, and does not address the corresponding development in literature. For a discussion of the writing of literature in post-Conquest England, see: L. Ashe, *The Oxford English Literary History. Volume 1: 1000-1300: conquest and transformation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), especially chapter 2.

[22] R. W. Southern, 'Aspects of the European Tradition of Historical Writing, 4: The Sense of the Past', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th Series, vol. 23 (1973), pp. 243-63 at. p. 246. E. M. C. van Houts, 'Historical Writing' in *A companion to the Anglo-Norman World,* eds. C. Harper-Bill and E. M. C. van Houts (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2002), p. 120. See also: G. Martin and R. M. Thomson, 'History and History books', in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain vol. 2: 1100-1400*, eds. R. M. Thomson & N. J. Morgan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 400-415. P. Damian-Grint, *The New Historians of the twelfth-century Renaissance: Inventing Vernacular Authority* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1999), p. 44.

[23] For the development in intellectual thinking, see: M. D. Chenu, *Nature, man and society in the twelfth century: essays on new theological perspectives in the Latin West* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997). Also, C. Walker Bynum, *Jesus as mother: studies in the spirituality of the High Middle Ages* (Berkley: University of California Press, 1982).

[24] R. W. Southern, *Scholastic Humanism and the Unification of Europe,* 2 vols. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1995), vol. 1, pp. 208-214. R. W. Southern, *Medieval Humanism and Other Studies* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1970), p. 160. Southern, 'Aspects, 4: the Sense of the Past', pp. 246-7.

books throughout Europe in this period.[25] Webber specifically suggested that these increases in literary resources may have a relationship with the more rigorous pursuit of meditative monastic studies at these communities, which was driven by monastic reform.[26]

The writing of history and hagiography was a prominent activity of monks in this period, and formed part of the Benedictine practice of *lectio divina*. Monastic texts in the twelfth century illustrate the development of *lectio divina*, as exegesis moved towards tropology, and to moral psychology and individual spirituality.[27] Monastic writing was intended to incite the reader to the practice of virtue and to promote praise of God. Individual stories were inserted in the history of salvation, wherein God, who desires the salvation of the elect, directs events. Commentators such as Benedictine monk and literary scholar Jean Leclercq have discussed the apparent tension in monastic writing between, firstly, presenting good examples and, second, offering an accurate recording of a subject's life.[28] Leclercq suggested that, especially in the writing of hagiography, that the balance was more sharply skewed towards the need to edify through creating good *exempla*.[29]

The late-eleventh and early-twelfth centuries were a period of widespread monastic and church reform initiatives. The authors studied in this thesis were incorporating contemporary themes and models into their descriptions of historic characters and events, and therefore, social developments relating to the church and clergy are relevant to the discussion. There have been a number of monographs which have directly addressed this topic. Henry Mayr-Harting's *Religion, Politics and Society in Britain 1066-1272* explored

---

[25] R. Gameson, *The Manuscript of Early Norman England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 15-20. R. M. Thomson, *Books and Learning in twelfth-century England: the ending of alter orbis* (Hertfordshire: Red Gull Press, 2006). T. Webber, 'Monastic and Cathedral Book Collections in the late eleventh and twelfth centuries' in *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland*, ed. P. Hoare, 3 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), vol. 1, pp. 109-125.

[26] Webber, 'Monastic and Cathedral Book Collections', pp. 109-111.

[27] D. Robertson, *Lectio divina: the medieval experience of reading* (Trappist, Ky. : Cistercian Publications, 2011), pp. xviii. Particularly useful are the chapters on the relationship between reading and writing (pp. 104-132) and the twelfth-century (pp. 203-230).

[28] J. Leclercq, *The love of learning and the desire for God: a study of monastic culture*, trans. C. Misrahi (New York: Fordham University Press, 1982), pp. 158.

[29] Leclercq, *The love of learning and the desire for God: a study of monastic culture*, pp. 159-161.

changing social conditions and the status of the church in this period, and the impact of these developments on the secular world.[30] Particularly useful are considerations of the effect of the so-called Gregorian Reforms on the relationships between the clergy and laity.[31] Other scholars have focussed on the relationship between the secular and regular clergy: Julia Barrow has examined the impact of contemporary monastic ideals on the secular clergy in this period.[32] Similarly, Hugh Thomas has surveyed the secular clergy in England, identifying the problems created by the intermingling of the religious and the secular clergy, which, Thomas has argued, sometimes amounted to 'war'.[33] Tensions between monastic, episcopal and secular authorities is a central theme in most of the texts studied in this thesis. The incorporation of contemporary Anselmian, and largely monastic, values into descriptions of secular clergy may represent a facet of these wider developments. Further, many of the studied texts address conflicts of power between monastic and/or ecclesiastic powers with their secular authorities, and unanimously advocate for the liberty of clergy from secular control. These cases may reflect wider tensions which were ongoing in medieval society.

Specifically within the Anglo-Norman sphere, the movement in monastic writing has been linked to the political and social disruptions of the Norman Conquest.[34] Van Houts has observed that similar increases in the writing of history occurred after comparable periods of upheaval, such as in 911 and 1204.[35] Aside from the texts explored in this thesis, there were a number of other notable histories produced in England and Normandy in the post-

[30] H. Mayr-Harting, *Religion, politics and society in Britain, 1066-1272* (Harlow, Longman, 2011).

[31] Mayr-Harting, *Religion, politics and society in Britain, 1066-1272*, pp. 22-44.

[32] J. Barrow, *The clergy in the medieval world: secular clerics, their families and careers in north-western Europe, c. 800-1200* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), pp. 71-114.

[33] H. M. Thomas, *The secular clergy in England, 1066-1216* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2014), especially, pp. 343-365, at pp. 343-344. See also: J. C. Crick & E. M. C van Houts, *A Social History of England, 900-1200* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

[34] See, e.g.: Gransden, *Historical Writing*, vol. 1, p. 105. For specific discussions of the impact of the Conquest on the writing of history: see M. Otter, '1066: the moment of transition in two narratives of the Norman Conquest', *Speculum*, 74:3, pp. 565-86. E. M. C. van Houts, 'The Memory of 1066 of 1066 in Written and Oral Traditions', *ANS* 19 (1997), pp. 167-79.

[35] van Houts, 'Historical Writing', p. 103.

Conquest period, such as those composed by Symeon of Durham, Orderic Vitalis, John of Worchester and the anonymous authors of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.[36]

Concerning the writing of hagiography in post-Conquest England, Norman uncertainty regarding the status of native English saints may have led English monks to create or revise existing *Vitae* for local cults. A number of prominent English monk-authors wrote collections of hagiographical works for English saints, such as Goscelin of Saint-Bertin, William of Malmesbury or Eadmer (whose hagiographical works are the subject of study in this thesis).[37] The extent of this Norman 'scepticism' has been debated, but there is a general consensus that English monastic communities felt the need to defend the cults of local saints who were often entirely without a written tradition.[38] However, this anxiety may

[36] For the critical editions of these authors' texts, see: Symeon of Durham, *Symeonis monachi opera omnia: volume 1, historiae ecclesiae dunhelmensis*, ed. T. Arnold (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012) & Symeon of Durham, *Symeonis monachi opera omnia: volume 2: historia regum*, ed. T. Arnold (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012). For Orderic Vitalis: Orderic Vitalis, *The ecclesiastical history of Orderic Vitalis*, ed. and trans. M. Chibnall (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969-1980). For John of Worchester: John of Worchester, *The Chronicle of John of Worchester,* eds. R. R. Darlington & P. McGurk, trans. J. Bray & P. McGurk, 3 vols (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1995-1998). For the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, see: Anon, *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: a Collaborative Edition*, general eds. D. Dumville & S. Keynes (Cambridge: D. S Brewer, 1983-)

[37] See: William of Malmesbury, *William of Malmesbury's saints' lives*, eds. and trans. M. Winterbottom & R. M. Thomson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002). Goscelin produced a number of hagiographical texts, but the canon on his works has yet to be established with absolute certainty. For an account of his life and works, see: R. C. Love, 'Goscelin of Saint-Bertin', in: *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), p. 213. The two most prominent scholars working on Goscelin are Rosalind Love and Tom Licence, who have together produced critical editions for some of Goscelin's saints' lives and miracles. See: Goscelin of Saint-Bertain, *The hagiography of the female saints of Ely*, ed. and trans. R. C. Love (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004) & *Three eleventh-century Anglo-Latin saints' lives: Vita S. Birini, Vita et miracula S. Kenelmi, and Vita S. Rumwoldi*, ed. and trans. R. C. Love (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1996). Also: Herman the Archdeacon and Goscelin of Saint-Bertin, *Miracles of St Edmund*, ed. and trans. T. Licence (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014). Licence has also suggested that Goscelin may be the author of an anonymous Life of St. Eadwold of Cerne: T. Licence, 'Goscelin of Saint-Bertin and the hagiography of St Eadwold of Cerne', *Journal of Medieval Latin* 16 (2007).

[38] J. Rubenstein, 'Liturgy against History: The Competing visions of Lanfranc and Eadmer of Canterbury, *Speculum* 74, 2 (1999), pp. 279-309. S. J. Ridyard, '*Condigna Vereratio*: Post-Conquest attitudes to the Saints of the Anglo-Saxons,' *ANS* 9 (1986), pp. 179-206. P. Hayward, 'Gregory the Great as "Apostle of the English" in

also be relevant to the writing of history, as modern historians such as William Aird, Jay Rubenstein and Southern have suggested that the authors of both historical and hagiographical texts sought to use precedent to protect existing communal rights and status following the Conquest.[39] This may be emphasised by the existence of texts such as Symeon of Durham's *Libellus de Exordio* and the Durham *Historia regum*, which, though not strictly hagiographical, were written to demonstrate the continuity of Symeon's community through the disruption of the Norman Conquest.[40]

The histories and saints' lives which are the subject of study in this thesis may form a part of this wider movement. One aim of Eadmer's *Historia* was to defend Canterbury's primacy and existing lands, as well as to advocate for the unprecedented nature of William the Conqueror's regalian rights, which were perceived as a threat to the liberty of prelates.[41] This discussion of defending pre-Conquest rights, however, is particularly relevant to the works of hagiography studied in this thesis, as some were openly written to defend English saints' claims to sanctity.[42] The research in this thesis demonstrating the incorporation of Anselmian themes into the *Vitae* of local English saints is an interesting aspect of this wider

---

Post-Conquest Canterbury', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 1:55, pp. 19-57. P. Hayward, 'Sanctity and Lordship in Twelfth-century England: Saint Albans, Durham, and the cult of Saint Oswine, King and Martyr' *Viator* 30, pp. 105-144.

[39] W. Aird, 'The Political Context of Symeon's *Libellus de exordio*' in *Symeon: Historian of Durham and the North*, ed. D. W. Rollason (Stamford: Shaun Tyas, 1998), pp. 32-45. Rubenstein, 'Liturgy Against History': the Competing Visions of Lanfranc and Eadmer of Canterbury'. Southern, 'Aspects', 4: The Sense of the Past', pp. 246-255.

[40] For overviews of Symeon's life and works, see: M. Gullick, 'The Hand of Symeon of Durham: further reflections on the Durham Martyrology Scribe', in *Symeon of Durham: Historian of Durham and the North*, ed. D.W. Rollason (Stamford: Shaun Tyas, 1998) & Symeon of Durham, *Libellus de exordio atque procursuistius hoc est Dunhelmensis, ecclesie*, ed. and trans. D.W. Rollason (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), pp. xlii-l.

[41] Southern, *Biographer*, pp. 306-307.

[42] For example, Osbern of Canterbury's *Vita Alfege* was a hagiographical work which was directly written to defend a local saint's cult which had been questioned by the new Norman invaders. After Anselm himself convinced Archbishop Lanfranc of Alfege's sanctity, as part of Alfege's rehabilitation, Osbern wrote the *Vita Alfege*. The case of Alfege often appears as an example in this debate, due to the availability of sources which attest to the process of composition, and demonstrate that Alfege's sanctity was under doubt.

attempt to rehabilitate native English saints. These cases may reflect efforts to modernise older cults, as monks sought to assimilate existing saints into the new social and cultural atmosphere of post-Conquest England.

Eadmer, the principal author studied in this thesis, has not attracted a great deal of interest from scholars examining this upsurge in Anglo-Norman history-writing. Eadmer and his *Historia* are largely absent from Beryl Smalley's survey *Historians of the Middle Ages* and Marjorie Chibnall's *The debate on the Norman Conquest*.[43] Similarly, more recent surveys of Anglo-Norman historical writing such as Emily Albu's *The Normans in their Histories: Propaganda, Myth and Subversion* and van Houts' overview of Anglo-Norman historical writing have not focussed on Eadmer in any depth.[44] One prominent exception is Antonia Gransden's 1974 *Historical Writing in England*. Gransden was at points critical of Eadmer's approach, commenting on his failure to provide a wider narrative of contemporary events and on the inclusion of forged documents in book V of the *Historia novorum in Anglia*.[45]

This general indifference to Eadmer's role as author stands in stark contrast to the fields of scholarship surrounding Eadmer's near-contemporaries. Eadmer's method of reporting recent events, often heard second-hand from Anselm or from a friend, is not radically dissimilar to the method of many of his contemporaries.[46] Yet these other Anglo-Norman historians, who were writing in the same period as Eadmer, have attracted lively interest from scholars, who have given attention to the question of how partisan interests

---

[43] B. Smalley. *Historians in the middle ages* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1974). M. Chibnall, *The Debate on the Norman Conquest* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999).

[44] E. Albu, *The Normans in their histories: propaganda, myth and subversion* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2001). van Houts, 'Historical Writing'. Eadmer falls outside of the 'Norman' scope of Albu's book, and merited only a cursory mention in van Houts' article. van Houts, 'Historical Writing', pp. 112-113.

[45] Gransden, *Historical writing,* vol. 1, p. 141. There are other exceptions, and some scholars use Eadmer extensively. One other notable case would be George Garnett's *Conquered England*, which although not technically a study of historical-writing, remains standard reading for students of the historiography of the Norman Conquest. See: George Garnett, *Conquered England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

[46] For example, Orderic Vitalis in books VII-XIII of the *Ecclesiastical History* or William of Malmesbury (especially in the *Historia Novella)* both recorded recent major political events, mostly heard second-hand. Orderic Vitalis, *The ecclesiastical history of Orderic Vitalis*. William of Malmesbury, *Historia Novella*, ed. E. King & trans. K. R. Potter (London: Nelson, 1955).

and intention may have affected the recording of events.[47] Eadmer has often, however, been seen as a progenitor of English national history, but of less skill and value than his near-contemporary William of Malmesbury, who was the intellectual giant of the era.[48] The reason for this lack of interest in Eadmer as an author, when compared to his contemporaries, may derive from Southern's low estimation of Eadmer's value as a scholar and author.[49]

Although Southern's primary research interest was Anselm, this scholar remains the foremost figure to the study of Eadmer and his contemporary Canterbury circle. Particularly, Southern's 1963 *Saint Anselm and his Biographer: a study of monastic life and thought 1059-c.1130*, and, to a lesser extent, the 1990 *Saint Anselm: a portrait in a landscape* dominate studies of Eadmer (and Anselm).[50] Southern directly addressed the inclusion of Eadmer in the *Preface* to the *Biographer*, and situated the scholarship on Eadmer as an

[47] Relating to the two histories mentioned above, see especially just a few examples of a considerable body of scholarship: William Aird's discussion of Orderic's presentation of secular rulers and Elisabeth Mégier's investigation into the themes of sin and salvation: W. Aird, 'Orderic's Secular Rulers and Representations of Personality and Power in the *Historia ecclesiastica,*' in *Orderic Vitalis: life, works and interpretations*, eds. C. C. Rozier, D. Roach, G. E. M. Gasper & E. M. C. van Houts (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2016), pp. 189-216. E. Mégier, 'Jesus Christ, a Protagonist of Anglo-Norman History? History and Theology in Orderic Vitalis's *Historia ecclesiastica*', in *Orderic Vitalis: life, works and interpretations*, eds. C. C. Rozier, D. Roach, G. E. M. Gasper & E. M. C. van Houts (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2016), pp. 260-283. P. Hayward, 'The Importance of Being Ambiguous: Innuendo and Legerdemain in William of Malmesbury's Gesta regum and Gesta pontificum Anglorum', *ANS* 33 (2010), pp. 75-102. Sønnesyn, *William of Malmesbury and the Ethics of History.*

[48] Eadmer has been seen as having shaped the revival of historical writing in twelfth-century England: see: A. Gransden, *Historical Writing in England: 550-1307*, 2 vols (London: Routledge, 1974), vol. 1, p. 138. More recently, C. Given-Wilson, *Chronicles: the writing of history in Medieval England* (London: Hambledon Continuum, 2004), p. 159.

[49] Southern Southern's treatment of Eadmer was often rather critical, and in the 1963 *Biography*, Southern presented Eadmer as somewhat simple in nature, speaking of Eadmer's 'intellectual limitations' and of Eadmer 'sinking back into his more representative role'. Southern, *Biography*, p. 276.

[50] Southern's characterisation of Anselm has been accepted by most modern historians, see: M. Brett, *The English Church under Henry I* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975), p. 71. F. Barlow, *The English Church, 1066-1154: A History of the Anglo-Norman Church* (London: Longman Higher Education, 1979), pp. 69-70, 287-92, 297-302. F. Barlow, *William Rufus* (London: Methuen, 1983), pp. 300-309. Southern's *Biography*, which included a summary of Eadmer's life and works, has proved especially useful to students of Eadmer.

extension of work on Anselm.[51] However, the later *Portrait* does not have a similar dual focus on the two men. In the *Preface* to this second text, Southern explains that in this second book, he has attempted to keep Anselm 'more fully and consistently at the centre'.[52] In this research, inevitably, Eadmer is viewed almost exclusively through the scope of his relationship with Anselm. This thesis seeks to reposition Eadmer, and his circle, as individual authors who shaped Anselm's legacy.

The most critical assessments of Eadmer's texts have tended to be made by historians seeking to disprove Eadmer's characterisation of King William Rufus. John Gillingham's recent biography of the king has made a vigorous defence of William Rufus' reputation by noting the inconsistencies between Eadmer's account when compared with other contemporary texts, such as those written by William of Malmesbury or Anselm's letter collection. Gillingham's case that Eadmer portrayed Rufus unfairly did not require any investigation into Eadmer's intention or method.[53] Previous analyses of Eadmer's treatment of William Rufus, such as those made by Emma Mason, Frank Barlow and Thomas Callahan, have also shown that Eadmer's account of the king in the *Historia* may be unrealistic. These earlier considerations have unanimously accused Eadmer of being 'biased', citing his monastic background and friendship with Anselm, but have not attempted to develop any sophisticated view of Eadmer's intention or method.[54]

Therefore, much of the scholarship investigating Eadmer's *Vita Anselmi* and the *Historia* has not investigated Eadmer's role as author, and instead utilises these texts as records for Anselm's life and for his disputes with the English kings. The extent to which Eadmer is read by scholars of Anselm or the English kings can be seen in the current

[51] Southern, *Biographer*, pp. xi-xiii. Southern mentions his fear that he has 'said more about him (Eadmer) than… he deserves'.

[52] Southern, *Portrait*, p. xv.

[53] J. Gillingham, *William II: The Red King* (London: Allen Lane, 2015). A similar assessment is presented in: E. Mason, *William Rufus: The Red King* (Stroud: Tempus, 2005).

[54] E. Mason, 'William Rufus: myth and reality', *Journal of Medieval History* 3:1 (1977), pp. 1-20, at p. 6. T. Callahan, 'The making of a monster: the historical image of William Rufus', *Journal of Medieval History* 7:2 (1981), pp. 175-195, at p. 177. F. Barlow, *William Rufus* (London: Methuen, 1983), p. 300. All three historians make vigorous defences of William Rufus against Eadmer, but present Eadmer's 'bias' as natural and inevitable, given Eadmer's dual position as a monk and friend of Anselm's.

translation of the *Historia*, completed in 1964 by Geoffrey Bosanquet. Although the final form of the *Historia* consisted of six books, only the first four books were translated. The final two books, which concern Eadmer's ecclesiastical career after Anselm's death, have never been translated. Southern, who wrote the foreword to Bosanquet's translation of the *Historia*, dismisses the final two books as having a separate purpose to the first four books, labelling them 'an appendix to the life of Anselm'.[55] Although this assessment may be fair, as the final two books were written later and are not a defence of Anselm, Southern took a different approach when translating the *Vita* and *Miracula* of Anselm. The *Miracula* were written at a later date and have a different purpose to the *Vita*, yet Southern translated the *Vita* and the *Miracula* in full in 1962.[56] The probable reason books five and six of the *Historia* have not been translated is because they are seen as having little value to the modern scholar. They do, however, contain several episodes indispensable to a student of historiography; Eadmer's deliberate inclusion of the Canterbury forgeries in book five is perhaps the most obvious example.[57]

The scholarship that has taken an almost unanimously critical approach to Eadmer's texts has generally investigated Eadmer's hagiographical works which are unconnected to Anselm. Southern conducted a survey of these hagiographical works in the 1963 *Biographer*, where he argued that Eadmer distorted history in order to promote Canterbury's metropolitan rights and to ensure historic narratives conformed with contemporary expectations of ecclesiastical procedure.[58] Southern found that Eadmer had employed this strategy in his *Vita Wilfridi*, *Vita Odonis*, *Vita Dunstani* and *Vita Oswaldi*. Other scholars have built on this foundation. Paul Hayward highlighted similar distortions: for example, that the *Vita Wilfridi* contained alterations from source-texts in order to promote the primacy of Canterbury.[59]

---

[55] *HN*, p. xi.

[56] *VA.*

[57] See R. W. Southern, 'Canterbury Forgeries', *English Historical Review* 73:287 (1958), pp. 193-226.

[58] Southern, *Biographer*, pp. 274-284.

[59] P. Hayward, 'An absent father: Eadmer, Goscelin and the cult of St. Peter, the first abbot of St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury', *Journal of Medieval History* 29:3 (2003), pp. 201-218. P. Hayward, 'St Wilfrid Ripon and the Northern Church in Anglo-Norman Historiography', *Northern History* 49 (2012), pp. 11-35.

One area of Eadmer's literary corpus where Southern consistently identified Eadmer's independent use of Anselmian themes was in the *Biographer*'s review of Eadmer's devotional texts. Throughout Southern's survey, he demonstrated how Eadmer modelled his devotional pieces on Anselm's work, but also noted Eadmer's disagreement with Anselm on a number of theological points.[60] There has been limited similar investigation into Eadmer's use of Anselmian themes in his hagiographical or historical works, although Andrew Turner and Bernard Muir have highlighted possible parallels in language between the *Vita Wilfridi* and Anselm's texts.[61]

Eadmer's texts have tended to be seen as existing in three fairly isolated groups, each with its own unique approach and character: Eadmer's *Historia* and *Vita Anselmi* are fairly reliable records with the latter resembling a biography, his hagiographical texts are unreliable texts filled with pro-Canterbury distortions and the devotional texts are largely modelled on Anselm's own works. This is probably a consequence of Southern's own divisions in this form in the survey in the *Biographer*, which scholars have followed. This thesis will investigate the incorporation of Anselmian themes into Eadmer's hagiographical and historical works, which together form the first two groups of texts.

There has been a comparable lack of investigation of the presence of Anselm's thought in other contemporary historical or hagiographical texts. The *Vita Alfege*, written by the Canterbury monk Osbern, has received relatively little interest from scholars of Anglo-Norman history. Frances Shaw, who translated the *Vita Alfege*, commented that the *Vita Alfege* has generally been dismissed as an unreliable text, as Osbern had virtually no original sources.[62] Jay Rubenstein is the principal scholar who has completed in-depth research on Osbern's texts.[63] Of particular interest to this thesis is one article which suggested that

[60] Southern, *Biographer*, pp. 287-298.

[61] *VW*, p. xlii. In addition, Giles Gasper identified Eadmer's attribution of an Anselmian notion of intention to Dunstan in the *Vita S. Dunstani*: G. E. M. Gasper, 'Economy distorted, economy restored: order, Economy and Salvation in Anglo-Norman monastic writing', *ANS* 38 (2015), pp. 51-65 at p. 56.

[62] *Vita Alfege*, p. 22.

[63] J. Rubenstein, 'The life and writings of Osbern of Canterbury', in *Canterbury and the Norman Conquest: Churches, Saints and Scholars, 1066-1109,* eds. R Eales & R. Sharpe, (London: The Hambledon Press, 1995), pp. 27-40.

alongside historic figures such as Dunstan, Osbern may have sought to model Alfege on Lanfranc and Anselm. Rubenstein found two parallels between the characters of Alfege in the *Vita Alfege* and of Anselm in Eadmer's *Vita Anselmi*, using the metaphor of clothing as a basis for this comparison. Rubenstein did not investigate any similarities in depth and explained:

> In general, a reader of his *Vita S. Elphegi* must notice similarities between the portrayal of the central figure in this Life and the central figure in a later Life written by Eadmer, the *Vita S. Anselmi*.

Rubenstein conjectured that any shared themes likely emerged from discussion between Osbern and Eadmer.[64] The study is a general summary of Osbern and his writing, and is not focussed on Anselm and Osbern. Chapter two of this thesis will develop Rubenstein's hypothesis that Osbern was using the living model of Anselm to form Saint Alfege.

Eadmer's *Vita Anselmi* and *Historia* had a fairly wide circulation, and may have been the primary way that Anselm's influence penetrated into the twelfth century. The immediate legacy of these texts can be seen particularly at Bec monastery and in the writing of William of Malmesbury, amongst circles associated with Anselm.

Studies of near-contemporary hagiographical or historical writing at Bec monastery have not investigated the possibility of the use of Anselmian themes.[65] The most relevant research in this area has been completed by Sally Vaughn, who has found some similarities between the character of Anselm in the *Vita Anselmi* and the characters of Herluin and Lanfranc as they were depicted in the *Vita Herluini* and *Vita Lanfranci*. Vaughn postulated that Anselm may have modelled his behaviour upon the examples of his predecessors, hence the parallels in the texts. This research rests uneasily on the premise that the Bec *Vitae*, which were written much later, accurately record minute details of their subjects' lives, and were not themselves influenced by other texts or models at Bec. Overall, this assessment is slightly undermined by Vaughn's identification of the degree to which the *Vita Anselmi* was reliant

[64] Rubenstein, 'The life and writings of Osbern of Canterbury', p. 37.

[65] For a survey of historical writing at Bec: M. Gibson, 'History at Bec in the twelfth century' in *The Writing of History in the middle ages: essays presented to Richard William Southern*, eds. R. H. C Davis & J. M. Wallace (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981), pp. 167-186. See also Vaughn, 'Historical writing among the monks of Bec'.

on existing exemplars taken from other texts.[66] Nevertheless, Vaughn's observation of similarities between the characters in the *Vita Anselmi* and the Bec *Vitae* highlights the degree to which these texts are inter-related.

William of Malmesbury, who was writing in England, incorporated the *Historia* into his 1125 *Gesta pontificum Anglorum*. When discussing William's approach to the task, Rodney Thomson observed that William occasionally deviated from the narration in the *Historia* and preferred details taken from the *Vita Anselmi*. Thomson suggested that William was using the *Vita Anselmi* to include extra information. It might be noted, however, that this use of the *Vita Anselmi* generally resulted in the exclusion of the corresponding passages from the *Historia*.[67] In this discussion, Thomson argued that William's professed admiration of Eadmer disqualifies the possibility of William having altered the text in any meaningful way. The incorporation of the *Historia* into the *Gesta pontificum* does imply that William perceived the *Historia* as valuable. However, William's *Gesta pontificum* and Eadmer's *Historia* had fundamentally different purposes and structures. The assumption that William would have made no effort to integrate Eadmer's work into the *Gesta pontificum* may disregard William's skills and dedication as an author.

---

[66] S. N. Vaughn, 'Anselm of Le Bec and Canterbury: Teacher by Word and Example, Following the Footprints of His Ancestors' in *A companion to the abbey of Le Bec in the central middle ages (11th-13th centuries)*, eds. B. Pohl & L. L. Gathagan (Boston: Brill, 2018), pp. 57-93. Vaughn is probably most notable for her invaluable contribution on the subject of Anselm's relationships with women – S. N. Vaughn, *St. Anselm and the Handmaidens of God: A study of Anselm's Correspondence with Women* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002). Vaughn has also written a number of books examining Anselm's life: S. N. Vaughn, *Anselm of Bec and Robert of Meulan: The Innocence of the Dove and the Wisdom of the Serpent* (California: University of California Press, 1992). S. N. Vaughn, *Archbishop Anselm 1093-1109: Bec Missionary, Canterbury Primate, Patriarch of Another World* (Oxford: Ashgate Publishing, 2012). See also: N. Vaughn, 'Anselm in Italy, *ANS* 16 (1993), pp. 245-70. Particularly relevant to chapter three of this thesis is her article on Eadmer's writing, see: S. N. Vaughn, 'Eadmer's *Historia Novorum*: A Reinterpretation', *ANS* 10 (1987), pp. 259-289. Further, Vaughn has written on history writing at the monastery of Bec, see: , S. N. Vaughn, 'Among these authors are the men of Bec: historical writing among the monks of Bec' in *Essays in Medieval Studies* 17 (2000), pp. 1-18 and S. N. Vaughn, 'The Students of Bec in England' in *Saint Anselm of Canterbury and His Legacy*, ed. G. E. M. Gasper (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 2012), pp. 73-91.

[67] William of Malmesbury, *William of Malmesbury's saints' lives*, eds. and trans. M. Winterbottom & R. M. Thomson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), pp. xxi-xxii.

One additional field of scholarship that has been particularly useful to this study are a number of recent studies exploring the patristic influences that underpinned William's narratives and characters. Different historians have argued that William used this strategy for either propagandistic or didactic reasons.[68] Sigbjørn Sønnesyn has been a prominent contributor to this field; his 2012 book *William of Malmesbury and the ethics of history* fully investigated the patristic influences in William's *Gesta regum Anglorum*.[69] Sønnesyn formed a particularly strong case that William saw his history as having educational value, then demonstrated the degree to which William sought to express an ethical system in his *Gesta regum.*

Authors & their texts

The authors studied in this thesis belonged to one distinctive intellectual circle, mostly comprised of monks residing at Canterbury, Christ Church and Bec monastery. As abbot of Bec and as archbishop of Canterbury, Anselm had played a leadership role at both monasteries. A great number of Anselm's personal friends and students were associated with these two communities, Anselm's relationships with these individuals often surviving through periods of physical separation through the exchange of letters. The authors studied in this thesis belonged to this specific circle of Anselm's friends and associates. Anselm was clearly central to this group, but many of these monks appear to have had friendships and intellectual relationships with each other, perhaps independent of Anselm. Authors in this group frequently either use or reference texts written by other figures within the same circle.

Although this thesis does not focus on manuscripts, using instead the critical editions that have emerged as part of the more focussed research completed on Canterbury,

[68] See primarily Weiler's articles: B. Weiler, 'Kingship, Usurpation and Propaganda in Twelfth-Century Europe: the Case of Stephen', *ANS* 23 (2001), pp. 299-326 – Weiler argued the basis of kingship models was derived from an Irish treatise *De duodecim abusivis saeculi*. Two articles argue these models were derived from patristic authors: B. Weiler, 'William of Malmesbury on Kingship', *History* 90 (2005), pp. 3-22 & B. Weiler, 'William of Malmesbury, Henry I, and the Gesta Regum Anglorum', *ANS* 31 (2009), pp. 157-76.

[69] Sønnesyn, *William of Malmesbury and the Ethics of History.*

Anselm's circle and Eadmer in the last twenty years, it is important to acknowledge the circulation of these ideas in their manuscript form. These movements are indicated where appropriate in the discussion that follows.

This circle of historians and hagiographers appears to have formed a network of monks writing to defend and promote the Canterbury-Bec image. Given that Anselm had played different roles within the communities, it is possible that they have been operating independently of each other to promote slightly different images of Anselm. However, certain themes associated specifically with Anselm appear across the texts written by these two communities. Further, Eadmer's Canterbury texts appear to have been accepted and used by the Bec community, as there is no life of Anselm produced at Bec. Together, the works promote Anselm's teachings, forming a distinctive vision of a Canterbury-Bec leader. It is likely that the models in these texts may have had considerable influence on the behaviour of future abbots and monks based at Bec and Canterbury.

Eadmer of Canterbury

Eadmer of Canterbury (c. 1060-1128) is the principal author of this study. Eadmer was one of Anselm's closest companions and was arguably the foremost English historian of the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries.

Throughout Eadmer's life, he wrote a series of hagiographical, historical and devotional texts. An investigation of Eadmer's incorporation of Anselmian themes into his hagiographical and historical works forms the first three chapters of this thesis. The dating of all of Eadmer's hagiographical texts is unclear, but these works span his literary career. Eadmer's earliest literary work is generally presumed to be the *Vita Wilfridi* (written c.1089-1097 and surviving in 4 manuscripts).[70] Later hagiographical works are: the *Vita Odonis* (pre-c.1100 and surviving in 5 manuscripts), the *Vita Dunstani* (c.1095-1104 and surviving in 6 manuscripts), the *Vita Oswaldi* (c.1112-1114 and surviving in 3 manuscripts) and the *Vita Bregwine* (post c.1123 and surviving in one copy, in Eadmer's hand: Corpus Christi College,

[70] *VW,* pp. lxii-lxviii. There are also two lost manuscripts, one in a twelfth-century hand.

Cambridge, MS 371).[71] Eadmer also wrote a *Breuiloquium* at a late date, which summarised his *Vita Wilfridi*.

Eadmer is best known for his twin works: the *Vita Anselmi* (survives in more than a dozen near-contemporary copies of different variants) and the *Historia novorum in Anglia* (surviving in two copies in Eadmer's own hand: Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 341, and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 452).[72] Eadmer's *Vita Anselmi*, written c.1114, is an account of Anselm's life and private conversation.[73] Around 1122, Eadmer added the *Miracula* to the *Vita Anselmi*, bringing the text to its final form.[74] The companion volume to this work is the *Historia*, which give an account of Anselm's troubles with English kings William Rufus and Henry I. The earliest form of the *Historia* was brought to completion c.1112, but at a later date Eadmer added two further books, which outline Archbishop Ralph's career and Eadmer's own brief ecclesiastical career.[75]

---

[71] Southern, *Biographer*, pp. 281, 283, 285, 367. Dating for the *Vita Wilfridi* (p. 367), the *Vita Dunstani* (p. 281), the *Vita Oswaldi* (p. 283) and the *Vita Bregwine* (p. 285). Dating for the *Vita Odonis* - Eadmer of Canterbury, *Lives and Miracles of Saints Oda, Dunstan and Oswald,* eds. and trans. A. J. Turner & B. J. Muir (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006), pp. xxii-xxiii. Further narrowing of these dates has been made by Turner and Muir. For the *Vita Wilfridi*: Turner & Muir have suggested that the *Vita Wilfridi* was written after 1093, preferring a dating of 1093-1097. *VW,* pp. xxix-xxx. The *Vita Dunstani*: Turner & Muir have argued that the manuscript evidence suggests an origin in France, indicating that it may date from Eadmer's second period in exile: 1103-1106. See: Muir & Turner, *Lives and Miracles of Saints Oda, Dunstan and Oswald,* pp. lxvii-lxix. For the manuscript tradition: *Vita Odonis*: Turner and Muir comment that at least three other manuscript copies are recorded, but are now lost. Muir & Turner, *Lives and Miracles of Saints Oda, Dunstan and Oswald,* pp. xliv-liii. *Vita Dunstani*: two other manuscript copies recorded, now lost. Muir & Turner, *Lives and Miracles of Saints Oda, Dunstan and Oswald*, pp. lxxvii-lxxxvii. *Vita Oswaldi*: Muir & Turner, *Lives and Miracles of Saints Oda, Dunstan and Oswald*, pp. cxvi-cxxi. For a summary of the *Vita Bregwine*, see: B. W. Scholtz, 'Eadmer's life of Bregwine, archbishop of Canterbury, 761-764', *Traditio* xxii (1966), pp. 127-48. For manuscript tradition, see: p. 136.

[72] *VA*, pp. xiii-xxiv. Both manuscript traditions are discussed in: Eadmer, *Historia*, pp. ix-xii, lxxxvi-cii. Southern, *Biographer*, pp. 372-3.

[73] Southern, *Biographer*, pp. 314-320. See also: J. Rubenstein, 'Biography and Autobiography in the Middle Ages', in *Writing Medieval History* ed. N. Partner (2005), pp. 53-69.

[74] Southern, *Biographer*, p. 319. Southern, *Portrait*, p. 427.

[75] *VA*, p. xxii.

In addition to his historical and hagiographical texts, Eadmer wrote a number of other texts: several hymns, a letter, and a number of meditational works.[76] Eadmer also composed a *Vita Petri*, which as Southern convincingly demonstrated, is less a life than a theological meditation. As a result, this text does not play a major role in the discussion that follows.[77]

Osbern of Canterbury

Osbern's hagiographical corpus consists of two works: the *Vita Dunstani* (surviving in more than a dozen near-contemporary manuscripts) and the *Vita Alfege* (surviving in one twelfth-century copy and two incomplete, fire-damaged eleventh-century copies).[78] The *Vita Alfege* was Osbern's earliest text and was probably composed after Anselm's first visit to Canterbury in 1079, and has been dated to c.1080.[79] Osbern's *Vita Alfege* text appears to have been inspired by Anselm's 1079 debate with Lanfranc, recorded much later in Eadmer's *Vita Anselmi*.[80] Osbern stated in the *Preface* to the *Vita Alfege* that Archbishop Lanfranc had ordered the writing of music in honour of Saint Alfege, however Osbern appears to have begun the *Vita Alfege* out of his own initiative.[81] The *Vita Dunstani* is believed to have been written somewhat later; Jay Rubenstein has suggested a date during the vacancy period after Lanfranc's death (1089-1093).[82]

[76] For a complete list, see the contents of Eadmer's MS 371 (it does not include the *Historia*). Not all of the texts were written by Eadmer, and some are thought to be taken from sermons preached by Anselm. See: Hayward, 'Gregory the Great as "Apostle of the English" in Post-Conquest Canterbury', p. 49.

[77] Southern, *Biographer*, p. 296.

[78] Osbern, *VD*, p. xxxii. The original manuscript of the *Vita Alfege* no longer exists. *Vita Alfege*, p. 24. The text is preserved in later medieval manuscripts.

[79] Rubenstein, 'The life and writings of Osbern of Canterbury', p. 35.

[80] *VA*, I, xxx.

[81] Osbern, *VA*, p. 122.

[82] Rubenstein, 'The life and writings of Osbern of Canterbury', pp. 28-30.

Anselm's legacy beyond Canterbury

The final chapter of this thesis focusses on a number of authors who were operating beyond Anselm's immediate Canterbury circle, mostly writing a period of time after Anselm's death. All of these authors bar one individual had probably never met Anselm. Instead, they were familiar with Anselm's character and teachings from oral accounts and Eadmer's texts. There authors were writing in a variety of different genres, at the abbeys of Bec and Malmesbury, and as such, their use of Anselmian themes is varied. This chapter demonstrates how secondary authors took different approaches when integrating Anselmian themes, and how these choices were related to the overall purposes of their texts. The relationships between these individual authors and Anselm will be explored in great depth in the introduction to chapter five; what follows here is a brief summary of their texts, with relevant manuscript information.

Gilbert Crispin

Gilbert is primarily known as an author of theology; he composed several notable works across his life: the *Disputatio Iudei et Christiani*, *De simoniacis*, *De Spiritu Sancto* and a number of other minor pieces.[83] Gilbert composed just one hagiographical text, written from c.1109, the *Vita Herluini* (surviving in 2 manuscripts).[84]

Milo Crispin/Anonymous

Milo Crispin was the likely author of a group of hagiographical works: the *Vita Lanfranci*, the *Vita Bosonis*, the *Vita Willelmi*, the *Vita Teobaldi* and the *Vita Letaldi*.[85] This

[83] A summary of these works can be found in: J. Armitage Robinson, *Gilbert Crispin Abbot of Westminster: A study of the Abbey under Norman Rule* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911), pp. 51-76. Also see: Abulafia & Evans, *The Works of Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster,* pp. xxv-xl.

[84] One is from the twelfth century, the second from the fifteenth. Abulafia & Evans, *The Works of Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster*, pp. xxxix-xxxvi.

[85] *Vita Lanfranci*: M. Gibson, 'Vita Lanfanci', ed M. Gibson in *Lanfranco di Pavia e L'Europa del secondo XI*, ed. G. d'Onofrio (Rome: Italia Sacra LI, 1995), pp. 661-715 at pp. 663-664. D'Achery used a Bec manuscript which is

collection of texts were written c.1136-1150 by an uncertain author who was based at Bec monastery.[86] The ascription of these works to Milo is both complex and contested, but depends on a note in a lost Bec manuscript of the *Vita Lanfranci*, which is included in the D'Archery edition of the work.[87]

A further text composed by an unknown Bec author around this period was the *De libertate Beccensis Monasterii*, dated to c.1136 (surviving in 1 manuscript: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, Latin 2342).[88] This author may have also written the *De professionibus monachorum* and the *De professionibus abbatum*, neither of which incorporate Anselmian influences in any real depth.[89]

William of Malmesbury

This Benedictine monk, writing at Malmesbury abbey, had a considerable literary output, writing works of hagiography, history and theology; a full summary can be found in Thomson's *William of Malmesbury*.[90] The text of particular significance to this study is the *Gesta pontificum Anglorum*, which was William's first work of history. The first edition of this work was completed by the middle of 1125, and covered the ecclesiastical history of

now lost. 'Vita Bosonis' in Migne, *PL*, vol. 150, CL, 723-32. 'Vita Theobaldi' in Migne, *PL*, vol. 150, CL, 733-34. 'Vita Letardi' in Migne, *PL*, vol. 150, CL, 756-6. 'Vita Willelmi' in Migne, *PL*, vol. 150, CL, 713-24.

[86] Collins, *Teacher in Faith and Virtue: Lanfranc of Bec's commentary on St. Paul*, p. 6.

[87] L. D'Archery, *Lanfranci cantuariensis archiepiscopi opera omnia* (Paris, 1648), p. 19AB.

[88] G. Constable, *Three Treatises from Bec on the Nature of Monastic Life* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), pp. 3-4, 10. Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec*, p. 64. See further discussion in: G. Nortier, *Les bibliothèques médiévales des abbayes bénédictines de Normandie* (Caen: Bibliothèque d'histoire et d'archeologie chretiennes, 1966), pp. 74, 69, 82. Gibson, 'History at Bec in the twelfth century', p. 171.

[89] Constable, *Three Treatises from Bec on the Nature of Monastic Life*, p. 3. 'De professionibus monachorum' in *Three Treatises from Bec on the Nature of Monastic Life*, ed. G. Constable and trans. B. S. Smith (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), pp. 29-106. 'De professionibus abbatum' in *Three Treatises from Bec on the Nature of Monastic Life*, ed. G. Constable and trans. B. S. Smith (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), pp. 107-134. For details of further works written by Milo Crispin and the author of the *De libertate*, see chapter five.

[90] A full summary of William's literary output with dating can be found in Thomson, *William of Malmesbury*, pp. 6-8.

England from Bede to William's own day. A significant portion of this work comprises William's incorporation of Eadmer's *Historia* into the text; William reworked Eadmer's account of Anselm's conflicts with his kings.

Synopsis

This thesis is formed of five chapters, which look at various elements of the incorporation of Anselm's thought into the hagiographical and historical writing of a range of different authors.

1. Eadmer of Canterbury's hagiographical writing

The opening chapter of this study explores the presence of Anselmian themes in Eadmer's hagiographical writing. Eadmer's use of Anselmian references to comment on historic events and the refashioning of historic figures to conform to a distinctively Anselmian model gives insight into Eadmer's authorial strategies. The inclusion of Anselmian themes in these texts recording historic events establishes the significance both of Anselm and of contemporary events to Eadmer's works.

2. Eadmer of Canterbury's *Vita Anselmi*

The second chapter investigates Eadmer's *Vita Anselmi*, an original work which consistently incorporates Anselmian themes to a considerable degree, especially when compared to Eadmer's reworking of other hagiographical texts. Anselm's Letter 37, which was included in the *Vita Anselmi*, appears to be fundamental to Eadmer's overall presentation of monastic life and human nature within this text. Although the presence of Anselmian thought within a life of Anselm may be expected, Eadmer's comprehensive exploration of these themes may indicate that the *Vita Anselmi* was written as an exposition of Anselm's teachings, rather than a simple recording of Anselm's life.

3. Eadmer of Canterbury's historical writing

Eadmer's strategy in the *Historia novorum in Anglia* represents a parallel but differing approach to his method in the *Vita Anselmi*. The *Historia* portrays Anselm, his opponents and the world using Anselm's own theological ideas; Eadmer heavily employs Anselmian

terminology and themes to create a highly theological style of narrative. In particular, the account of Anselm's dispute with William Rufus is described according to Anselm's theological concepts of evil, will and freedom.

4. Osbern of Canterbury's hagiographical writing

This chapter examines Osbern of Canterbury's parallel use of Anselmian ideas in his hagiographical writing. Osbern wrote one original piece, the *Vita Alfege*, and also reworked an existing text, the *Vita Dunstani*. The incorporation of Anselmian themes into these two works does in one aspect resemble Eadmer's approach, as Osbern's original work includes far more Anselmian themes and ideas, whereas the elements in the reworked *Vita Dunstani* are relatively piecemeal. Osbern's overall strategy, however, represents a different style of integration, which may reflect his comparatively limited access to Anselm's texts.

5. The Bec *Vitae* and William of Malmesbury

The final chapter of this thesis investigates the incorporation of Anselmian themes into texts written by a wider group of authors with connections to both Bec and Canterbury communities. All these texts post date Anselm's death, and most were written by a later generation of monastic authors, associated with Anselm's Canterbury-Bec circle. Although their personal contact with Anselm was mostly limited or non-existent, these authors had access to Anselm's letters and to Eadmer's *Vita Anselmi* and *Historia*. This chapter explores two different approaches taken by two groups of authors, whose texts had separate purposes. A number of Bec authors used Anselmian themes to insist on the pre-eminence of monastic and ecclesiastical authority over secular power, and also incorporated Anselmian themes into descriptions of the behaviour of Bec abbots. By contrast, William of Malmesbury's overview of English bishops suppressed the more monastic aspects of Eadmer's characterisation. These uses of Anselmian themes reveals the posthumous treatment of Anselm's ideas, as later authors emphasised or moderated certain aspects to fit with their texts.

Chapter 1: Eadmer of Canterbury's hagiographical writing

Eadmer of Canterbury's literary career, principally concerned as it was with hagiographical writing, reveals an increasing engagement with Anselm's teachings. A study of Eadmer's hagiographical works suggests that Eadmer re-envisioned the characters of historic saints to reflect Anselmian qualities, especially in later texts as his familiarity with Anselm's thought deepened. In addition, Eadmer used explicit Anselmian references and themes to defend Anselm's position in contemporary controversies. The clear development in Eadmer's use of distinctively Anselmian terminology and themes over time gives insight into Eadmer's development as an author. The introduction of a contemporary thinker's language and ideas into hagiographical texts recording the lives of historic saints represents, at a broader level, a point of heuristic intersection between contemporary intellectual study and the recording of hagiography, which has not been analysed in detail before.

Eadmer is best known for writing the *Vita Anselmi* and the *Historia novorum in Anglia*, which together give an account of Anselm's private (monastic and devotional) and public life. However, Eadmer first won recognition amongst his contemporaries for composing works of hagiography which appear completely unrelated to Anselm. These texts tend to be derivative of earlier models, Eadmer's purpose being to unite several divergent accounts into one comprehensive and simple narrative. The dating of these works is almost uniformly uncertain, but they span Eadmer's literary career. Richard Southern suggested that Eadmer's earliest literary work was the *Vita Wilfridi*, composed 1089-1097.[1] The scholarly consensus for the dating of Eadmer's later hagiographical works is as follows: the *Vita Odonis* (pre-1100), the *Vita Dunstani* (1095-1104) and the *Vita Oswaldi* (1113-1114). Eadmer also composed a smaller life of Archbishop Bregwine (written after 1123).[2]

[1] Southern, *Biographer*, pp. 277-279, 367. Southern, *Portrait,* p. 408.

[2] Southern, *Biographer*, pp. 281, 283, 285, 367. Dating for the *Vita Wilfridi* (p. 367), the *Vita Dunstani* (p. 281), the *Vita Oswaldi* (p. 283) and the *Vita Bregwine* (p. 285). Dating for the *Vita Odonis* - Eadmer of Canterbury, *Lives and Miracles of Saints Oda, Dunstan and Oswald,* eds. and trans. A. J. Turner & B. J. Muir (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006), pp. xxii-xxiii. An excellent overview of medieval sainthood can be found in: A. Vauchez, *La sainteté en Occident aux derniers siècles du Moyen Age: d'après les procès de canonisation et les documents*

The subjects of Eadmer's hagiographical works reflect his interest in the Canterbury community, as the texts were often written to promote the cults of foremost Canterbury saints or to defend rights claimed by the community.[3] The *Vita Wilfridi* and *Vita Dunstani* were composed to defend Canterbury's claims to possess the subjects' relics, directly opposing competing claims that had been made by the communities of Ripon and Glastonbury.[4] Only the *Vita Oswaldi* was not written for the church of Canterbury, but was commissioned by Eadmer's friends at Worcester.

Existing scholarship has already established Eadmer's distortion of his source-texts to promote Canterbury's metropolitan rights and to ensure historic narratives conformed with contemporary expectations of ecclesiastical procedure. These partisan alterations have been identified across Eadmer's hagiographical corpus. Southern argued that the *Vita Wilfridi* 'established the Canterbury version in a definitive way', and that Eadmer's 'insistence on the metropolitan rights of Canterbury' and his positive portrayal of historic Canterbury archbishops 'required some distortion of the contemporary sources'.[5] Similarly, Southern termed parts of the *Vita Odonis* as 'false history' because of Eadmer's misrepresentation of tenth-century ecclesiastical procedure, and commented that Eadmer created an 'idealised picture of the tenth century'.[6] Southern found comparable distortions in the texts of the *Vita Dunstani* and the *Vita Oswaldi*. His survey of Eadmer's hagiographical texts repeatedly

---

hagiographiques (Rome: Ecole française de Rome/Paris: Diffusion de Boccard, 1981). Another important scholar in this field is Monique Goullet, who has created a typology which can be applied to any rewritten text to facilitate classifying and examining changes made to hagiographical texts. See: M. Goullet, 'Vers une typologie des réécritures hagiographiques, à partir de quelques exemples du Nord-Est de la France', in *La réécriture hagiographique dans l'Occident Médiéval. Transformations formelles et idéologiques.* eds. M. Goullet and M. Heinzelmann (Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2003), 109–44 & M. Goullet, *Écriture et réécriture hagiographiques. Essai sur les réécritures de Vies de saints dans l'Occident latin médiéval (VIIIe-XIIIe s.)* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005).

[3] Saint Dunstan had been recognised as the chief saint of Canterbury, Saint Oda was also a central figure in Canterbury's history - he had brought the relics of Wilfrid and Ouen to the community and had been a major figure in the tenth-century church reform. The life for Bregwine gave Eadmer an opportunity to discuss the old church and the burial places of previous archbishops. For discussion, see: Southern, *Biographer*, pp. 279-283.

[4] Southern, *Biographer,* pp. 277-279, 281-283.

[5] Southern, *Biographer*, pp. 278-279.

[6] Southern, *Biographer*, p. 281.

emphasised Eadmer's method as: 'He (Eadmer) read the present into the past and presented his idealised picture of the past as an object lesson to contemporaries'.[7] Other scholars have found similar trends; Hayward identified alterations in Eadmer's *Vita Wilfridi* which appear to promote the primacy of Canterbury.[8]

Eadmer's strategy of distorting his hagiographical texts in Canterbury's favour may correspond with his general dedication to the defence of Canterbury community's rights. This manifests itself elsewhere in Eadmer's non-hagiographical writing, such as a surviving letter he wrote to the Glastonbury monks, which attacks their claim to hold Saint Dunstan's relics.[9] Eadmer's career in the church was also affected by his loyalty to Canterbury; Eadmer's attempt to fight for Canterbury's metropolitan rights ultimately doomed his own appointment as bishop of St. Andrews, where he relinquished his ring and staff without ever obtaining episcopal consecration.[10] The alterations in Eadmer's hagiographical works appear, then, to reflect his general interest.

Although Eadmer's impartation of pro-Canterbury, contemporary readings onto historic narratives has been recognised, there has been little investigation into any comparable distortions made in the defence of Anselm. Eadmer wrote the *Vita Anselmi* to establish Anselm's cult as a Canterbury saint and continued to pursue Anselm's ecclesiastical policies after his death, as evident in the struggle at St Andrews. Eadmer may not have seen such a distinction between supporting his archbishop and his community, and his partisan agenda may have resulted in distortions intended to defend both Anselm and Canterbury. There is evidence too that Eadmer wrote some of his hagiographical texts as Anselm's student. In the *Vita Anselmi*, Eadmer explains: 'Now as I had been supported by his (Anselm's)

[7] Southern discussed Eadmer's addition of 'imaginary' details to the text of the *Vita Dunstani* and suggested Eadmer gave the *Vita Oswaldi* a contemporary gloss, illustrating how Eadmer read the present into the past. See: Southern, *Biographer*, pp. 283-284, quotation at p. 284.

[8] P. Hayward, 'St Wilfrid Ripon and the Northern Church in Anglo-Norman Historiography', *Northern History* 49 (2012), pp. 11-35.

[9] Southern, *Biographer*, p. 285.

[10] Southern, *Biographer*, p. 236.

help and strengthened by his corrections in some other things which I had written…'.[11] It is likely that Eadmer was referring to one or more of his early hagiographical texts. A limited range of scholarly attention has focused directly on areas where Anselm's influence may have manifested in Eadmer's hagiographical writing. Andrew Turner and Bernard Muir, the editors of the *Vita Wilfridi*, identified stylistic similarities between the *Vita Wilfridi* and Anselm's own writing.[12] In addition, Giles Gasper's research emphasises Eadmer's attribution of an Anselmian notion of intention to Dunstan in the text of the *Vita Dunstani*.[13] However, the subject has received no more extensive study than this, despite its considerable potential to deepen analysis of Eadmer and his relationship with Anselm.

Anselm and the image of a Saint

One significant way in which Eadmer altered contemporary source-texts to reflect Anselm's teachings is in the characterisation of hagiographical subjects. Turner and Muir noted some changes to the portrayals of saints Dunstan and Oswald, but did not suggest any connection to Anselm. In the *Vita Dunstani*, the editors observed Eadmer's 'systematic erasure' of Dunstan's involvement in lawsuits and the removal of Dunstan's use of bribery.[14] Turner and Muir noticed more marked changes in the appearance of Oswald's character, concluding:

> The Oswald who appears in Eadmer's *Vita Oswaldi* is above all a Benedictine saint, *pater Oswaldus*, whose overriding concern is for the spiritual safety and development of his monks, and whose involvement with worldly matters diminishes markedly towards the end of the work.[15]

[11] *VA*, II, lxxii: ego autem qui iam in nonnullis quae scripseram eius ope fretus et emendatione fueram roboratus.

[12] *VW*, p. xlii.

[13] G. E. M. Gasper, 'Economy distorted, economy restored: order, Economy and Salvation in Anglo-Norman monastic writing', *ANS* 38 (2015), pp. 51-65 at p. 56.

[14] Turner & Muir, *Lives and Miracles of Saints Oda, Dunstan and Oswald,* pp. lxxiii-lxxiv.

[15] Turner & Muir, *Lives and Miracles of Saints Oda, Dunstan and Oswald*, p. cxi.

Eadmer's elimination of Dunstan's involvement in worldly affairs such as legal proceedings may relate to Eadmer's more extensive transformation of Oswald into a monastic figure, disinterested in worldly matters. As the *Vita Dunstani* was composed at a mid-point in Eadmer's career and the *Vita Oswaldi* was written later, the removal of lawsuits from the *Vita Dunstani* may represent an earlier stage in Eadmer's re-envisioning of hagiographical subjects.

Eadmer's remodelling of Dunstan and Oswald's characters may be related to themes which appear in Eadmer's portrait of Anselm in the *Vita Anselmi*. In this text, Eadmer characterises Anselm as the epitome of monastic qualities and as disinterested in worldly matters.[16] In book two, Eadmer dedicates a chapter to Anselm's reported hatred of worldly business, describing how Anselm could be made physically ill by secular dealings [*secularia negotia*], but would instantly regain his health if his attention was turned to spiritual topics.[17] Eadmer considered lawsuits to be 'secular business'; in the *Vita Anselmi* Eadmer twice explicitly identified lawsuits as being 'secularia negotia'.[18] In an early chapter principally concerned with Anselm's lawsuits as abbot of Bec, Eadmer details Anselm's conduct in these secular pleadings [*secularibus negotiis*].[19] The opening to this chapter establishes that Anselm preferred to delegate all of these secular duties if possible:

> He (Anselm) delegated the business of the monastery to the care and attention of brethren in whose uprightness and energy he had confidence, and he gave himself up continually to the contemplation of God, and to the instruction, admonishment and correction of the monks. And when any important business of the church arose which it was not thought proper to settle in his absence, he disposed of it as justice required, according to the circumstances and nature of the case…[20]

[16] For a full investigation of Eadmer's presentation of Anselm's character in the *Vita Anselmi*, see chapter 3 of this thesis. Eadmer emphasises Anselm's monastic qualities and presents Anselm as intolerant to the world throughout this text.

[17] *VA*, II, xiii. Anselm's hatred of secular business is also mentioned in *VA*, II, viii.

[18] *VA*, I, xxvii & *VA*, II, xi.

[19] *VA*, I, xxvii.

[20] *VA*, I, xxvii: Delegatis itaque monasterii causis curae ac sollicitudini fratrum, de quorum vita et strenuitate certus erat, ipse Dei contemplationi, monachorum eruditioni, admonitioni, correctioni jugiter insistebat.

Eadmer makes it clear that only when Anselm's presence was essential did the abbot attend to these matters. Eadmer goes on to describe Anselm's habit of discoursing on the gospels during these trials and even falling asleep.[21] The picture of Anselm's lack of interest in legal proceedings is partially balanced by Eadmer's assertion that Anselm never allowed himself to be overreached in these lawsuits.[22] This theme is continued into the account of Anselm's behaviour as archbishop of Canterbury, where Eadmer reiterates Anselm's hatred of all secular business and emphasises again that these matters could make Anselm ill.[23] Eadmer's removal of Dunstan's lawsuits and the re-characterization of Oswald as a monastic figure may reflect Eadmer's use of Anselm as a model of ecclesiastical excellence.

A comparison of Eadmer's depiction of identical figures at the beginning and end of his literary career can demonstrate Eadmer's re-characterization of historic figures and his changing perception of the appropriate behaviour and attitude of a saint. As a result of the relationship between Saints Oda and Oswald, two of Eadmer's hagiographical texts include the same section of narrative. Duplicated scenes appear in the early pre-1100 *Vita Odonis* and was reworked in the later 1113-4 *Vita Oswaldi*. The uncertain dating of the *Vita Odonis* suggests that these two scenes were written at least fifteen years apart, straddling Eadmer's literary career. This presents a rare opportunity to observe Eadmer's changing treatment of the themes and characters in his texts, as the mature Eadmer revised his early work. A comparison of the sections reveals stark differences in Eadmer's presentation of Saint Oda.

Quando autem aliquid magni in negotiis Ecclesiae erat agendum quod in ejus absentia non aestimabatur oportere definiri.

[21] There is a clear similarity to the scene in *VA*, II, xiii, where Eadmer also juxtaposes Anselm's need to discuss the gospels with his hatred of secular business. In addition, there is a similar scene in William of Malmesbury's account of Wulfstan in the *Gesta pontificum Anglorum*, see: *GPA*, 140. This second parallel is discussed in more detail in chapter five.

[22] *VA*, I, xxvii. Eadmer also describes Anselm waking up to instantly dispel frauds during the lawsuits. Eadmer shows Anselm as fulfilling these duties and properly defending Bec's rights and properties.

[23] The topic of lawsuits also appears where Anselm is shown to advise a man who was looking after the lawsuits of his monastery. Anselm explains that a monk should be reluctant to leave his monastery to attend to secular business [*seculari negotio*], but must do this if his abbot orders it. The monk 'may lose some masses on this account' [*quamvis aliquando pro talibus missas perdat*], but this may be balanced by his obedience. *VA*, II, xi.

These alterations are distinctively Anselmian, as in the later *Vita Oswaldi* Eadmer incorporates themes from Anselm's teachings alongside Anselmian terminology.

The dating of these two texts is unclear, but scholars agree that the *Vita Odonis* represents a very early stage of Eadmer's career as an author, and that the *Vita Oswaldi* was written much later. The editors of the *Vita Odonis* argued that the manuscript evidence suggested that the work was in circulation before 1100. The work is often assumed to be the second of Eadmer's hagiographical works on account of its positioning in his autograph manuscript: Eadmer placed the *Vita Odonis* directly after the *Vita* and *Breuiloqium* of Wilfrid.[24] The most recent source used in Eadmer's *Vita Odonis* is Osbern's *Vita Dunstani*. The dating of Osbern's text is also uncertain, although Jay Rubenstein has used Osbern's references to Archbishop Lanfranc to hypothesise that Osbern's text may have been composed in the period between Lanfranc's death in 1089 and Anselm's accession in 1093.[25] Eadmer's later *Vita Oswaldi* appears to be connected with the election of Nicolas as prior of Worcester in 1113. A fire mentioned in the work appears to be the great fire of 1113, which destroyed much of Worcester city. On these grounds, a date around 1113-1114 is assumed to be reasonably probable.[26]

The specific scene which appears both in the *Vita Odonis* and the *Vita Oswaldi* explores Archbishop Oda's interactions with King Eadwig. In both texts, Eadmer gives an account of Oda's reaction to Eadwig's illicit relations with several women and then includes a character portrait of the saint. The differences between the texts appear to derive from Eadmer's incorporation of Anselmian themes into his later work.

Eadmer's principal source for his earlier *Vita Odonis* was his fellow Canterbury monk Osbern's *Vita Dunstani*. However, when describing Oda's reaction and response to Eadwig and his mistresses, Eadmer instead chose to use a secondary source written by Byrhtferth,

[24] Turner & Muir, *Lives and Miracles of Saints Oda, Dunstan and Oswald,* pp. xxii-xxiii. Southern, *Biographer*, p. 279.

[25] J. Rubenstein, 'The life and writings of Osbern of Canterbury', in *Canterbury and the Norman Conquest: Churches, Saints and Scholars, 1066-1109,* eds. R Eales & R. Sharpe (London: The Hambledon Press, 1995), pp. 27-40, at. p. 38.

[26] Southern, *Biographer*, pp. 283-4. Turner & Muir did not dispute Southern's dating: Turner & Muir, *Lives and Miracles of Saints Oda, Dunstan and Oswald,* p. xxiii.

another *Vita Oswaldi*. In his *Vita Odonis*, Eadmer depicts Oda's response to the king's adultery:

> Oda, exercising his pontifical authority, sent soldiers and abducted one of the women described earlier by force from the palace of the king where she was residing… Oda branded her with a white hot iron and disfigured her face, expelled her, and regulated her to perpetual banishment in Ireland.[27]

Eadmer then discusses the woman's attempts to return to England and describes the healing of her scarred face. The detail of Oda branding the woman's face is not included in Osbern's *Vita Dunstani*. Eadmer's inclusion of the episode may reflect an interest to present Oda, the subject of the *Vita Odonis*, as being central to events. Eadmer's account establishes Oda as a powerful, active and vigorous archbishop, ready to take violent action against wicked individuals negatively influencing the king.[28]

Ten to twenty years after the writing of this section in the *Vita Odonis*, Eadmer revisits the scene, now recording the events in his *Vita Oswaldi*. Eadmer writes:

> Flanked by a troop of his own soldiers, he (Oda) seized her by force from the royal court where she was dwelling and condemned the woman to perpetual exile in Ireland.[29]

Some of the Latin wording between the two accounts is similar, but Eadmer chooses to remove any mention of the striking instance where Oda branded the woman's face. Eadmer's principal sources for the later *Vita Oswaldi* are his own *Vita Odonis* and Byrhtferth's *Vita Oswaldi*, and both accounts contain the face branding. Eadmer's removal of the incident, follows Osbern's *Vita Dunstani*, which similarly omits the branding. This return to Osbern's

[27] *VOO*, p. 28: Pontificali auctoritate usus, unam de praescriptis mulieribus quam et amplior potentia et obscenior impudentia dehonestabat… missis militibus, a curia regis in qua mansitabat uiolenter abduxit, et eam in facie deturpatam, ac candenti ferro denotatam, perpetua in Hiberniam exilii relegatione destrusit.

[28] The event with Oda branding the woman's face may conform to a tradition of active, vigorous Canterbury saints. Dunstan reportedly dragged the king out of his bedchamber when he was missing mass. See: *VD*, p. 98.

[29] *VO*, p. 223: Eam siquidem, suorum militum manu uallatus, a regali curia in quia mansitabat ui abduxit, adductam perpetuo exilio in Hiberniam condemnauit.

account has been explained as due to Eadmer's 'dissatisfaction' with his original account or simply a need for 'variation'.[30]

Eadmer's later dissatisfaction with his own *Vita Odonis* and the exclusion of the face branding episode from the *Vita Oswaldi* may reflect also the influence of Anselm's pastoral and educational theories. Anselm was unconvinced of the merits of corporal punishment, as evidenced in his letters and from anecdotes in Eadmer's *Vita Anselmi*. In Letter 141, Anselm wrote to Prior Henry of Canterbury, intervening on behalf of the runaway monk Moses and specifically requested that the brothers refrained from beating Moses upon his return to the monastery.[31] In the *Vita Anselmi*, Eadmer recounts Anselm's gentle treatment of the unruly young monk Osbern and also gives an account of Anselm advising a fellow abbot not to beat his disobedient monks.[32] Eadmer's narrative suggests that Anselm's aversion to the use of physical punishment is related to notions regarding the most effective way to rehabilitate sinners. In Eadmer's record of Anselm's discussion with the unnamed abbot in the *Vita Anselmi*, Anselm argues:

> The strong soul delights in and is refreshed by solid food, as patience in tribulation, not coveting one's neighbour's goods, offering the other cheek, praying for one's enemies, loving those who hate us, and many similar things. But the weak soul, which is still inexperienced in the service of God, needs milk, - gentleness from others, kindness, compassion, cheerful encouragement, loving forbearance, and much else of the same kind.[33]

Both Anselm's letter collection and the *Vita Anselmi* suggest that Anselm was convinced that kindness and moderation were more effective when reforming the wicked, and that the use of physical violence was often fruitless.

---

[30] Turner & Muir, *Lives and Miracles of Saints Oda, Dunstan and Oswald*, pp. xxxvi, cviii.

[31] Anselm, *Ep.* 141.

[32] *VA*, I, x & xxii.

[33] *VA*, I, xxii: Fortis anima delectatur et pascitur solido cibo, patientia scilicet in tribulationibus, non concupiscere aliena, percutienti unam maxillam praebere alteram, orare pro inimicis, odientes diligere, et multa in hunc modum. Fragilis autem, et adhuc in Dei servitio tenera, lacte indigent, mansuetudine videlicet aliorum, benignitate, misericordia, hilari advocatione, caritativa supportatione, et pluribus huiusmodi.

One particularly relevant example of Anselm's sympathetic attitude towards sinners, even those who were lapsed monks or nuns, are his letters to the nun Gunhilda.[34] Gunhilda fled her Wilton Abbey nunnery with Count Alan Rufus, in around 1093. When Alan Rufus died soon after, she lived with his brother, Alan Niger.[35] Despite the serious nature of Gunhilda's crime, Anselm's letters are beseeching in tone as he pleads with Gunhilda to return to Wilton Abbey. Southern noted that there is degree of affection found in Anselm's letters to Gunhilda which is often reserved for those Anselm considered as his friends.[36]

Anselm's general disapproval of corporal punishment and his own sympathetic treatment of other sinful women may have led Eadmer to feel that omitting the very violent action of face branding was necessary. Eadmer's return to a source which he initially rejected may represent his later and more Anselmian approach to the behaviour of a Canterbury saint.

In the later *Vita Oswaldi*, Eadmer made further alterations to Oda's character, again using language which may reflect the influence of Anselm's teachings. In both *Vitae*, Eadmer includes, immediately after outlining Oda's treatment of Eadwig's mistress, a few lines outlining Oda's character. In the earlier text of the *Vita Odonis*, this account proceeds to the end of this section as follows:

> Oda, the supreme bishop, was a man sustained by the strength of his own virtues and the maturity and constancy of his many years; he was an unyielding opponent of every evil deed. For neither the allurements of any worldly joy, the menacing threats of men, nor the suffering of any kind of loss could deter him from the path of righteousness. Since he neither hoped for or was afraid of anything, he was able to disarm the rage of all violent men.[37]

---

[34] Anselm, *Epp.* 168, 169.

[35] Southern suggests Gunhilda was abducted, but some commentators have highlighted that Anselm's letters suggest some sort of mutual affection. See discussion in: Southern, *Portrait*, pp. 262-264.

[36] Southern, *Portrait*, p. 263.

[37] *VOO*, p. 28: Erat quippe summus pontifex Odo uir uirtutum robore, et grandaeuitatis maturitate, ac constantia fultus, et omnium iniquitatum inflexibilis aduersarius. Non hunc alicuius gaudii saecularis illecebrae, non hominum minae, non cuiusuis damni perpessio poterat a rectitudine deterrere. Quapropter quia nec sperabat aliquid nec expauescebat, omnium impotentium exarmabat.

In this portrait, Eadmer focusses on Oda's strength of character in resisting both temptation and coercion, and describes this in terms of Oda's relationships with the world and with other human beings.

In the later *Vita Oswaldi*, Eadmer also includes a character-portrait after the description of Oda's treatment of the king's mistress. The parallel description in the later text reads:

> For he was a man supported in all things by the strength of his unalloyed impartiality; he showed no favour to any perpetrator of injustice and was concerned only with following [*obsequi*] the will of God [*uoluntati dei*] in all things. And God too in his mercy was always with him and inclined his ears to Oda's wishes [*uoluntati*].[38]

Eadmer has shifted the emphasis of the narrative in the later text to focus on Oda's personal relationship with God. Although the two sections are essentially synonymous in meaning, the first portrait of Oda repeatedly references other human beings, but does not mention God. In the later *Vita Oswaldi*, God is now central to the narrative, as Eadmer depicts a reciprocal and personal relationship as existing between God and Oda, even specifying that God 'inclined his ears' [*aures suas inclinabat*] to Oda's will. The earlier example may convey Oda's virtuous character, but in the second excerpt, Oda is depicted as a good man because he is solely concerned with following God's will.

Eadmer's authorial choices reflect a wide range of Anselmian ideas, particularly, as here, the central importance of God's will to human aspirations and behaviour. One of Anselm's fundamental theological tenets was the primacy of God's will over man's, prominent in the *Cur Deus homo*, developing an earlier exploration in the three treatises *De veritate*, *De libertate arbitrii* and *De casu diaboli*.[39] In the *Cur Deus homo*, Anselm emphasises that God's will is pre-eminent; this idea is central to his analysis of human nature. Eadmer's mention of

[38] *VO*, p. 223: Erat quippe uir uiribus purae aequitatis per omnia fultus, nec alicui iniquitatis ministro fauens, uoluntati Dei in cunctis obsequi satagebat. Quapropter et Deus ei sua Misericordia semper aderat, ac uoluntati illius aures suas inclinabat.

[39] The primacy of God's will over man's is integral to the text of the *Cur Deus homo*, and is often explained in terms of the debt of obedience humanity owes to God. Anselm, *Cur Deus homo*, I, 8-9, 11-5, 21-23. Anselm, *De veritate*, 8 & 9. Anselm, *De libertate arbitrii*, 1, 8, & 12. Anselm, *De casu diaboli*, 4.

Oda 'following God's will in all things' in the *Vita Oswaldi* employs the correct Anselmian terminology 'uoluntati dei', which is used extensively in Anselm's theological writing.

Eadmer's mention of Oda as inclining his will towards God's may further reference another important idea from Anselm: the importance of intention. In the *De veritate* Anselm argues that what makes an action either 'just' or 'unjust' is connected to the subject's will. In this text, Anselm explains the necessity to will correctly, in dialogue form between the Teacher and the Student:

> T. What if someone understands rightly or acts rightly but does not will rightly: will anyone praise him on account of justice?
>
> S. No.
>
> T. Therefore, this justice is not rightness of knowledge or rightness of action but is rightness of will.[40]

Anselm's discussion emphasises the subject's will when performing an action, rather than the action alone. Eadmer's initial characterisation of Oda in the *Vita Odonis* indicates that Oda was a good archbishop and was able to overcome numerous obstacles because of his character, virtues and maturity. In the later *Vita Oswaldi*, Eadmer's narrative appears to reflect Anselm's ideas that actions without correct intention are meaningless and the only correct intention for doing good is for God.

In addition, Eadmer's depiction of Oda's reciprocal relationship with God establishes God and Oda's mutual will, which reflects a common theme from Anselm's letters and theology. The achievement of a mutual love and will with God is given central importance in Anselm's thought. In a letter written to Hugh the Hermit, Anselm explained:

[40] Anselm, *De veritate*, 2: MAG: Quid, si quis recte intelligit, aut recte operatur, non autem recte velit; laudabit eum quisquam de justitia? DISC: Non. MAG: Ergo non est ista justitia scientiae rectitudo, aut rectitudo actionis; sed rectitudo voluntatis.

> Moreover, since reigning in heaven is nothing but being so welded in love into one will with God and all holy angels and men… If, therefore, you will to be king in heaven, love God and men as you should and you will deserve to be what you choose.[41]

The overlap in the accounts in the *Vita Odonis* and the *Vita Oswaldi* and Eadmer's rewriting of this section is an instance where Eadmer's development as an author is evident. This case-study reveals how Eadmer's conception of the appropriate behaviour of his subject and the proper way to describe this behaviour changed dramatically over a period of time, with the later text showing a great deal of influence from Anselmian thought. The probable early and late dating of the two texts in this case-study provide a chronological coherence to the argument that Anselm had a considerable impact on Eadmer's understanding of what it was to be a saint. Eadmer's use of Anselmian terminology when reshaping Oda's character to conform to Anselm's model represents a particularly visible incorporation of Anselmian thought into hagiography.

Eadmer's use of Anselmian allusions in Anselm's defence

When re-writing his source-texts, Eadmer also inserted phrases, sections of reported speech or even original scenes which are distinctively Anselmian, either in terminology or concept. These cases develop in frequency and complexity across Eadmer's hagiographical corpus, but often appear to act as defences of Anselm's positions in contemporary political or personal conflicts. Eadmer's insertion of these Anselmian references at particularly relevant points represent, it can be argued, the author's comparison of historic saints' disputes to Anselm's own contemporary struggles.

The *Vita Wilfridi*

Eadmer's earliest hagiographical works are the *Vita Odonis* and the *Vita Wilfridi*. The *Vita Odonis* does not appear to draw on Anselmian themes, and the text also differs from

[41] Anselm, *Ep.* 112: Denique quoniam regnare in caelo non est aliud quam sic conglutinari cum deo et cum omnibus sanctis angelis et hominibus per dilectionem in unam voluntatem… si ergo vis esse rex in caelo, ama deum et homines sicut debes, et mereberis esse quod optas.

Eadmer's other works due to its lack of a prologue. By comparison, in the *Vita Wilfridi*, Eadmer appears to have experimented with some Anselmian themes and ideas.

The dating of Eadmer's *Vita Wilfridi* is disputed. In 1963, Southern suggested a period of composition between 1089-1097, and in 1990 confined this further to 1089-1093.[42] Turner and Muir, the editors of the *Vita Wilfridi*, did not dispute Southern's 1990 dating, but argued that it is possible that the *Vita Wilfridi* was written after 1093, preferring a dating of 1093-1097. They commented that Wilfrid's: 'staunch defiance of King Ecgrith's secular authority – would have been highly relevant at Canterbury in the period of Anselm's bitter disputes with William II and Henry I'.[43]

The *Vita Wilfridi* does not heavily incorporate Anselmian references and themes in the method of Eadmer's later works. However, Anselmian allusions and arguments do make an appearance, particularly in narratives which were relevant to contemporary disputes. One case where Eadmer may have employed a distinctively Anselmian allusion to defend Anselm's contemporary position occurs in a scene in which Bishop Wilfrid returns from Rome. Eadmer explains that Wilfrid was stopped on his way home by armed men who were protesting the bishop's interference in the secular affairs of the land of the Franks. In this account of a conflict between ecclesiastical and secular authorities, Eadmer independently attributes a distinctively Anselmian defence to Bishop Wilfrid, manipulating the other sources upon which his composition is based.

The *Vita Wilfridi* was written primarily from three works: Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*, Frithegod's *Breuiloquium uitae uirtutum et obitus beuti Wilfridi episcopi et confessoris* and the priest Stephen's eighth-century *De vita sancti Wilfrithi Deo digni Episcopi*. These three source-texts are inter-related; Stephen's text acted as a source for both Bede and Frithegod's texts. Although Eadmer used all three texts as sources, he particularly favoured Frithegod's work, which was widely considered to be a text of utmost importance due to an inaccurate attribution to the Canterbury saint Oda.[44] In the scene where Bishop Wilfrid returns from Rome and faces the accusations, Eadmer was mainly using Frithegod's narrative, with the

[42] Southern, *Portrait*, p. 408. Southern*, Biographer*, p. 277.

[43] *VW,* pp. xxix-xxx.

[44] *VW*, pp. xxx-xxxiv.

priest Stephen's account as a probable secondary source.[45] The account of Wilfrid facing the accusations consists of two parts: the attacking men's charges and Wilfrid's response. In the *Vita Wilfridi*, Eadmer repeats the accusations of the attacking men, following Frithegod, but then formulates an original defence for Wilfrid. This response incorporates elements from both Frithegod's and the priest Stephen's accounts, but also uses Anselmian terminology.

In Eadmer's *Vita Wilfridi*, the attacking men specifically accuse Wilfrid of interfering in the region's secular affairs and of opposing the king. Wilfrid responds as follows:

> If I did not act according to law when to the best of my ability I put back in control of his hereditary a king who had been unjustly driven from his kingdom, and a fair decision of the most just Judge in his court holds this to be the case, I concede that I should straightaway receive the punishment of just vengeance. But if I acted in this deed in no way unlawfully, but rather according to the law, as the very innocence of my mind convinces me, and if you still wish to kill me, then I very willingly desire to die because I deem that having died for justice I ought to be crowned with the glory of martyrdom.[46]

Eadmer's defence of Wilfrid's actions appears to be an original defence. The suggestion of Wilfrid's willingness to suffer martyrdom may be related to Wilfrid's very brief response in

[45] This scene is not depicted in Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica.* Stephen's text, which was the source for Frithegod's, records Wilfrid's actions as motivated by kindness and common decency, and in this earliest text, Stephen gives Wilfrid an extended response. Frithegod condenses this scene, depicting a band of robbers accusing Wilfrid of 'violating royal authority' and threatening Wilfrid with death. In Frithegod's text, Wilfrid is shown to deny any accusation that he has acted wrongly, and the sense that Wilfrid is being wrongly accused is heightened by the identification of the men as robbers. Frithegod records Wilfrid's defence in a single line: 'opto pati gaudens pro nomine Christi'. Fridegoda, 'Vita Sancti Wilfridi', in *The Historians of the Church of York and its archbishops*, ed. J. Raine, 3 vols (London: Longman & co, 1879-94), vol 1, pp. 105-160 at p. 136.

[46] *VW*, pp. 80-83: Si non iure, inquit, feci cum regem regno inuiste depulsum, quantum in me feit, hereditarie dignitati prefeci et hoc ita penes se esse iustissimi Iudicis equitas habet, fateor, penas iuste ultionis promptissime pendam. Quod si nequaquam hoc in facto contra ius, sed cum iure feci, uelut ipsa mee innocentia mentis mihi testatur, eo libentius, si uultis occidere, mori desidero, quo me pro iustitia occisum martyrii gloria coronandum fore considero.

Frithegod's text, which also includes this theme.[47] Eadmer's use of the repeated opposition of 'justice' and 'injustice' and 'according to the law' and 'unlawfully' echoes themes from the priest Stephen's earlier version of Wilfrid's response. The priest Stephen similarly juxtaposed opposing terms such as 'truth' and 'lie' and 'good' and 'bad' to build Wilfrid's case, but Stephen's text does not refer to justice, injustice or the law.[48] In the *Vita Wilfridi*, Eadmer transforms Frithegod's very brief defence into a far stronger advocation for the legitimacy of ecclesiastical authority in secular affairs, basing this defence upon what is 'just'.

Assuming that Muir and Turner's 1093-1097 dating of the *Vita Wilfridi* is accurate, Eadmer's defence of Wilfrid's interference in secular affairs and opposition to the king may be related to Anselm's fractious relationship with King William Rufus. Anselm and William Rufus disagreed over the appropriate roles of ecclesiastical and secular authorities, especially with regard to church government. Anselm's disputes with William Rufus concerned the king's regalian rights, primarily William Rufus' control over church councils and over state recognition of the pope. Eadmer's emphasis on Wilfrid as acting justly and according to the law mirrors discussion of Anselm and William Rufus' conflict, both as this appears in Eadmer's later *Historia* and in Anselm's own letter collection. In Eadmer's account of Anselm's opposition to William Rufus in the *Historia*, Eadmer explains this dispute in terms of Anselm's 'justice' opposing the king's 'injustice'.[49] In Anselm's Letter 210, he defended his defiance of William Rufus by arguing that the king's wishes had been against 'the law and will of God'. [50]

---

[47] Fridegoda, *Vita Sancti Wilfridi*, ed. J. Raine, p. 136: An pravum gessi, regem dum forte remisi? Inquit, et opto pati gaudens pro nomine Christi.

[48] Stephanus, *The Life of Bishop Wilfrid*, ed. and trans. B. Colgrave (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), p. 69: Veritatem dico in Christo Iesu et per sanctum Petrum apostolum non mentior, quod talem virum exulantem et in peregrinatione degentem secundum praeceptum Dei populo Israhelitico, qui accola fuit in terra aliena, auxiliatus enutrivi et exaltavi in bonum et non in malum vestrum, ut aedificator urbium, consolatory civium, conciliator senum, defensor Dei ecclesiarum in nomine Domini secundum eius promissum esset. O rectissime episcope, quid aliud habuisti facere, si exul de genere nostro ex semine region ad sanctitatem tuam perveniret quam quod ego in Domino feci?

[49] *HN*, p. 102. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 98: factum est ut et viri justitia firmius crederetur, et injustitia hominis eum non aequo judicio fatigantis...

[50] 'The king demanded of me that in the name of righteousness, I should give my consent to his intentions which were against the law and will of God.' (Fröhlich's translation) Anselm, *Ep.* 210: Exigebat enim a me rex ut voluntatibus suis, quae contra legem et voluntatem Dei erant, sub nomine rectitudinis assensum praeberem.

Eadmer's creation of Wilfrid's defence of ecclesiastical authority and defiance of royal power reflects themes which were later used to justify Anselm's own defiance. If Eadmer was writing this text contemporaneously with Anselm's troubles with William Rufus, then this version of Wilfrid's defence may reveal Eadmer's early engagement with Anselm's own arguments. Eadmer may have been drawing a comparison between Wilfrid and Anselm's positions.

Aside from the incorporation of the opposing terms of justice and injustice and the reference to the law, Eadmer also makes a particularly clear Anselmian allusion in the final lines of Wilfrid's speech. At the close of Wilfrid's speech, Eadmer has Wilfrid argue that if he died 'for justice', he would therefore die as a martyr: 'quo me pro iustitia occisum martyrii gloria coronandum fore considero'.[51] Eadmer's mention of martyrdom was probably inspired by Frithegod's text, although Eadmer does not use Frithegod's words. In Frithegod's text, after Wilfrid is threatened with death by the attacking men, Wilfrid simply replies: 'opto pati gaudens pro nomine Christi [I would be pleased to suffer for the name of Christ]'.[52]

There are similarities between Eadmer's portrayal of Wilfrid's willingness to be martyred in the *Vita Wilfridi* and the account of the martyrdom of another historic English bishop, Canterbury's Archbishop Alfege, which appears in Eadmer's later *Vita Anselmi*. Alfege had been murdered by Vikings in 1012 after refusing to ransom himself for money, an action which saw his veneration as a saint.[53] A sceptical Lanfranc contested Alfege's sanctity on grounds of the unorthodox nature of the saint's death. In an extended scene in the *Vita Anselmi*, Eadmer records Anselm's 1079 defence of Alfege's sanctity:

> Moreover, there is the witness of Holy Scripture, as you, Father, very well know, that Christ is both truth and justice; so he who dies for truth and justice [*pro justitia et veritate*] dies for Christ [*pro Christo*]. But he who dies for Christ is, as the Church holds, a martyr. Now Saint Elphege as truly suffered for justice as Saint John did for truth.[54]

[51] *VW,* p. 83.

[52] Fridegoda, *Vita Sancti Wilfridi*, ed. J. Raine, p. 136.

[53] For the debate and the relevance of Alfege to Anselm and Canterbury: Southern, *Portrait*, p. 316.

[54] *VA*, I, xxx: Cum testante sacro eloquio ut vestra paternitas optime novit Christus veritas et justitia sit; qui pro justitia et veritate moritur, pro Christo moritur; qui autem pro Christo moritur, Ecclesia teste, martyr habetur.

This logic in the *Vita Anselmi* may be found in Eadmer's defence of Wilfrid's stance. Frithegod's text explains that Wilfrid is willing to die 'pro nomine Christi', which Eadmer replaces with 'pro iustitia'. Eadmer is using Anselm's reasoning; that 'pro jusititia' is interchangeable with 'pro veritate' so dying 'for justice' is sufficient reason to consider someone a saint. The representation of Anselm's argument in the 1079 debate as being novel strongly suggests that Eadmer is making an allusion to the contemporary discussion surrounding Alfege's martyrdom. It is notable that in Eadmer's later *Historia* and *Vita Anselmi*, this author draws a clear parallel between Alfege's historic case and Anselm's contemporary position, describing their resistance to unreasonable demands using similar language.[55] If Anselm was struggling with his king at this point, this reference may compare Wilfrid's staunch adherence to 'the law', regardless of his own safety, with Anselm's contemporary position.

This case-study highlights the complexities of Eadmer's authorial method and the degree of inter-play between Eadmer's various texts. Eadmer's reformulation of this single scene reflects influences from both of his source-texts, but also alludes to Anselm's contemporary conflict with William Rufus.

The *Vita Dunstani*

This method of inserting original lines which use Anselmian formulations and appear to refer to contemporary issues is used in a similar, but more substantial form in Eadmer's *Vita Dunstani*. This work was probably composed between 1098 and 1106, with indirect internal evidence within the text suggesting that it was written early in the reign of King Henry I. The manuscript evidence suggests an origin in France, indicating that it may date from Anselm (and Eadmer's) second period in exile: 1103-1106.[56] Eadmer's *Vita Dunstani* was a re-working of a far more popular version by Osbern of Canterbury, Eadmer purporting to object

Beatus vero Elphegus aeque pro justitia, ut beatus Johannes passus est pro veritate. The phrase 'pro iustita' is repeated three times in the section which details Anselm's defence of Alfege.

[55] *VA*, I, xxx & II, v.

[56] Muir & Turner, *Lives and Miracles of Saints Oda, Dunstan and Oswald,* pp. lxvii-lxix.

to a few inaccurate details and to Osbern's literary style.[57] The overall narrative of Eadmer's *Vita Dunstani* does not differ hugely in the account or arrangement of events, but a study of the text reveals that Eadmer includes Anselmian vocabulary, allusions and parallels sporadically throughout the work.[58] When these allusions do occur, Eadmer now employs the correct Anselmian terminology and inserts original scenes.

One of Eadmer's most distinctive Anselmian allusions in the *Vita Dunstani* appears when Dunstan is forced into exile by King Eadwig. Given that Eadmer's *Vita Dunstani* was probably written during a period of Anselm's exile, this historic episode may have appeared particularly relevant to contemporary events. When narrating Dunstan's exile, Eadmer makes a clear allusion to Anselm's *Cur Deus homo*, seeming to use the reference to attack the disloyalty of the Canterbury monks. Eadmer writes:

> For she saw to it with the king that he should issue orders for everything possessed by Dunstan's monastery to be seized and destroyed and for the man himself to be expelled from the kingdom and driven into exile. While this storm was raging, a lamentable and evil thing happened. For some of the brothers of that monastery, who ought to have protected Dunstan against all jealous people and to have obeyed him in the manner of good sons even unto death [*et ei usque ad mortem more bonorum filiorum obsequi deberent*], being imbued with their own wickedness rather than his teaching, secretly threw themselves into the midst of events in order to encourage the king to oppose him…[59]

---

[57] It is possible that out of these two reasons, the latter may have been the more pressing. In Eadmer's original prologue, he only mentions style as his reason for re-writing Osbern's *Vita Dunstani*, and it is only later in his autograph manuscript that he adds a large section complaining about Osbern's inaccuracies. Historians have observed that these seem minor variations, and it is possible that Eadmer's long explanation has more to do with contemporary events than his motivations for re-writing the material. *VD*, pp. 45-49.

[58] For example, Eadmer refers to Dunstan efforts to 'obey the will of God' (*uoluntati Domini obsequendo*) and his attempts to learn what is 'the will of God' (*quid uoluntati Dei*) and then work 'the will of God' (*uoluntatem Dei*). As discussed earlier in this chapter with reference to Eadmer's *Vita Oswaldi*, these are probably Anselmian references. *VD*, pp. 57, 61, 77.

[59] *VD*, p. 98: Effecit nanque apud regem ut cuncta quae in monasterio Dunstani habebantur diripi ac deuastari, et ipsum a regno eliminatum in exilium pelli iuberet. Qua tempestate seuiente, contigit quoddam lacrimabile malum. Quidam enim ex fratribus monasterii qui uirum contra omnes emulos tueri, et ei usque ad mortem

The source of this episode is likely to be to the text written by the anonymous 'B' author, where the writer mentions that Dunstan's 'disciples' had conspired against him. Eadmer alters 'disciples' to 'brothers of the monastery', and then inserts the Anselmian allusion.

The line 'et ei usque ad mortem more bonorum filiorum obsequi deberent' is an addition by Eadmer, and is a fairly clear reference to Anselm's *Cur Deus homo*. In this text, Anselm elaborated in detail on the Biblical phrase 'usque ad mortem' in book 1, chapters 8-10.[60] In book 9 of the *Cur Deus homo*, Anselm explains the meaning of becoming 'obedient unto death' as follows:

> Anselm: Why did the Jews persecute Him to the point of death [*usque ad mortem*]?
>
> Boso: For no other reason than that He held unwaveringly to justice and truth in His deeds and words.
>
> Anselm: I think that God requires this of every rational creature and that every rational creature owes this to God as a matter of obedience.[61]

Elsewhere in the *Cur Deus homo*, Anselm uses *debere* and conjugated forms of the same verb to speak of the debt of obedience owed by man to God: the verb occurs two hundred and two times in the text. Although Anselm does not use *debere* in conjunction with the phrase *usque ad mortem*, the importance of *usque ad mortem* is central to the treatise, and the combination of these two themes can only point towards the *Cur Deus homo*. Elsewhere in Eadmer's hagiography, he chooses to use 'obsequeor' when speaking of obedience to a will

---

more bonorum filiorum obsequi deberent, propria nequitia magis quam ipsius doctrina imbuti, se medios ad proucandum regem contra illum clanculo iniecere… This mention of the betrayal of the monks is not detailed in Osbern's *Vita Dunstani*: Osbern described how Dunstan's monks were persecuted. However, in the author B's *Vita Dunstani*, there is a new detail that Dunstan's 'disciples' conspire against him. Eadmer altered this to Dunstan's monks, then adds in the Anselmian phrase. Osbern, *VD*, p. 101. Author 'B', 'Vita Dunstani', in *Memorials of Saint Dunstan, archbishop of Canterbury*, eds. W. Stubbs (London: Longman & co, 1874), pp. 3-52 at pp. 33-34.

[60] Anselm, *Cur Deus homo*, I, 8-10.

[61] Anselm, *Cur Deus homo*, I, 9: ANS. Cur persecuti sunt eum Judaei usque ad mortem? BOS. Non ob aliud nisi quia veritatem et justitiam vivendo et loquendo indeclinabiliter tenebat. ANS. Hoc puto quia Deus ab omni rationali creatura exigit; et hoc illa per obedientiam Deo debet.

[*uolentati*] rather than Anselm's preferred term in the *Cur Deus homo* [*obediens*], for instance in the earlier discussion of Oda's obedience to God's will.[62]

Eadmer's use of this Anselmian theological allusion in the *Vita Dunstani* may have been intended to accuse the Canterbury monks of disloyalty or even of aggravating the tension between Anselm and Henry I. There is evidence that Anselm was criticised for his extended exiles, and was even blamed for the troubles of the English church during his absence. Some of these charges may have originated from within the Canterbury community. Letter 310, written c.1104, by a member of the community at Canterbury (probably Prior Ernulf) directly entreated Anselm to return to England and held Anselm as responsible for the increase of evils in England.[63] Anselm sent a number of letters to Canterbury monks during this period, refuting a variety of charges: particularly see Letters 311, 327, 336.[64] There is also evidence that the community may have sought to co-operate with Henry I in Anselm's absence, as in Letter 349 Anselm explicitly forbade Prior Ernulf and his monks from giving Henry I any money from Anselm's revenues unless he was reinvested with the archbishopric.[65] There was clearly disagreement with Anselm's policies at Canterbury during this period, and criticism even from senior monks in positions of leadership.

Eadmer's reference in the *Vita Dunstani* appears to accuse the Canterbury/Glastonbury monks of being disobedient to God through their failure to have 'obeyed him (Dunstan/Anselm) in the manner of good sons even unto death'. The use of this allusion in the account of Dunstan's exile is crucial, and the indictment would have been visible for a contemporary reader who was even loosely acquainted with Anselm's works and with current affairs. This is a more advanced use of Anselm's theological writing to comment on contemporary events, and suggests that Eadmer had a reasonably strong grasp on the text of the *Cur Deus homo*, and expected similar familiarity from the intended, Canterbury,

[62] In the *Cur Deus homo*, Anselm explains that God 'willed His death; and [in keeping this will] the Son was obedient unto death and learned obedience by the things He suffered'. Anselm, *Cur Deus homo*, I, 10: et mortem illius voluit; et quia ipse filius oboediens fuit usque ad mortem et didicit ex iis quae passus est oboedientiam, *VOO*, p. 45. *VD*, p. 223. *VO*, pp. 231, 247.

[63] Anselm, *Ep.* 310.

[64] Anselm, *Epp.* 311, 327, 336.

[65] Anselm, *Ep.* 349.

audience. The *Vita Dunstani* did not just survive in France, but was included in Eadmer's edited collection, which was made at Canterbury.[66] Eadmer was not a writer who often detached himself from Canterbury.[67]

Allusions to Anselm's contemporary situations appear elsewhere in the *Vita Dunstani*. Eadmer's preferred method of inserting defences of Anselm's position into his hagiographical writing is in the form of reported speech, especially those attested to the subjects of his works. This chapter has already explored one example of this use of reported speech, in the case of Wilfrid's defence in the *Vita Wilfridi*.

In the text of the *Vita Dunstani*, Eadmer appears to move beyond inventing speeches, and may have created entirely new scenes which were intended to defend Anselm's position. The most notable example of Eadmer creating episodes in the defence of Anselm explores the appropriate relationship between ecclesiastical and secular authorities. In the *Vita Dunstani*, Eadmer relates that during Dunstan's time as archbishop of Canterbury, a certain nobleman, 'the Count', engaged in an unlawful marriage, and would not respond to Dunstan's reprimands or act of excommunication. This count first secures support from King Edgar through misrepresenting Dunstan. After an ineffectual intervention by the king the count purchases the support of the pope in Rome with money. The pope orders Dunstan to apologise to the count and reconcile him to the church, an order which Dunstan firmly refuses, responding:

> When I see that man who is at the centre of this undertake penance for his sin, I will willingly obey the commands of the Lord Pope. But God would not wish that he (the Count) should wallow in this sinful state and immune from ecclesiastical discipline insult us and derive joy from that. Moreover, God forbid that I should set aside the

[66] Southern, *Biographer*, pp. 367-374.

[67] For an example, see Eadmer's narration of the Council of Bari, where Eadmer elaborates at length on a cope belonging to the Bishop of Benevento which had links to Canterbury instead of recording the council in detail. Eadmer, *Historia*, pp. 107-110.

> law [*legem*] which that same lord of mine, Christ the son of God, determined should be preserved in his church, for the sake of any mortal man or to preserve my safety.[68]

After hearing Dunstan's words, the count feels shame for his actions. He is terrified of the dangers that befall excommunicated individuals and as a result repents in full.

The source for this scene is not Osbern's *Vita Dunstani*, but Adelard of Ghent's *Vita Dunstani*, written c.1006-11. In this version of Dunstan's life, Adelard briefly relates, in less than a dozen lines, Dunstan's refusal to co-operate, even under papal mandate, with a nobleman engaged in an unlawful marriage. Adelard uses the case to comment on Dunstan's unmoveable rocky nature.[69] Eadmer greatly expanded this mention, almost five-fold, and omitted Adelard's own emphasis, instead inserting new details such as Dunstan's speech and the penance of the count. The editors of Eadmer's *Vita Dunstani* identified the expansion as a novel introduction by Eadmer, and suggested that the account may derive from an oral source as they were unable to identify any literary origin.[70]

This defence which is attributed to Dunstan mirrors Anselm's own pleas in a letter to the pope in 1099 or 1100, where Anselm complained that William Rufus was asking him to put the king's will above God's and act against the law. In Letter 210, Anselm wrote: 'The king demanded of me that in the name of righteousness, I should give my consent to his intentions which were against the law [*legem*] and will of God.'[71] The theme of the king demanding obedience when his will was against God's continues throughout the letter. Anselm outlined the offences which were against God's will and explained that he chose to go into exile rather

---

[68] *VD*, pp. 117-8: Equidem cum illum de quo agitur sui delicti poenitudinem gerere uidero, praeceptis domini papae libens parebo. Sed ut ipse in peccato suo iacaet, et immunis ab aecclesiastica discipina nobis insultet, et exinde gaudeat nolit Deus. Auertat etiam Deus a me ut ego causa alicuius mortatlis hominis, uel pro redemptione capitis mei, postponam legem quam seruandam statuit in sua aecclesia idem dominus meus, Christus filius Dei.

[69] Adelard, 'Vita Dunstani', in *Memorials of Saint Dunstan, archbishop of Canterbury*, eds. W. Stubbs (London: Longman & co, 1874), pp. 53-68 at p. 67.

[70] *VD*, pp. 117-8.

[71] Anselm, *Ep.* 210: Exigebat enim a me rex ut voluntatibus suis, quae contra legem et voluntatem Dei erant, sub nomine rectitudinis assensum praeberem

than allow them to continue under his rule. Later in the letter, Anselm entreated the pope not to order him to return without a change in political circumstances:

> I pray and beseech you, with as much fervour as I can, not to command me to return to England under any circumstances, unless in such a way that I be allowed to place the law [*legem*] and will of God [*voluntatem dei*] and the Apostolic decrees above the will of man…[72]

This juxtaposition of the self-will of man alongside God's will, which is truth, is a common theme in Anselm's theological writings as well as his letters, and here is brought to use in defence of his own actions.[73]

The extended scene in the *Vita Dunstani* portrays Dunstan in a parallel situation to the contemporary Anselm, and uses a mirrored response to defy instructions which would have put Dunstan in conflict with God's law. Eadmer may have chosen Dunstan as a suitable subject due to his exiles and disputes with the kings. Dunstan's defiance is explained: unwillingness to obey a man's will instead of God's law. The reasoning for this, that God does not wish it, therefore, even for the sake of a powerful mortal or for his personal benefit, Dunstan cannot obey, is identical to Anselm's own reasoning in the Letter 210. Eadmer even deploys similar language to describe Dunstan's objection. As Eadmer's additions have no traceable origin from previous texts, the details may be entirely a creation by Eadmer. Not only does this scene act as a justification of Anselm's actions, but it also creates a precedent for Anselm's behaviour in the form of the actions of one of the most respected and famous Canterbury archbishops. If this text was written during Anselm's second exile as has been hypothesised by the editors, the expansion and manipulation of this example could act as a defence of Anselm's decisions to travel into exile. As already mentioned, Anselm was widely criticised for this exile. In the c.1104 letter, probably written by Prior Ernulf, Anselm was asked to examine the: 'order of ancient custom'.[74] The insertion of an Anselmian defence into the mouth of

[72] Anselm, *Ep.* 210: Precor igitur et obsecro quanto possum affectu, ut nullo modo in Angliam redire iubeatis, nisi ita ut legem et voluntatem dei et decreta apostolica voluntati hominis liceat mihi praeferre.

[73] For example: Anselm, *De casu diaboli*, 4.

[74] Anselm, *Ep.* 310: Quod si dispensationis ecclesiasticae regulam et antiquae consuetudinis ordinem sollicita studuisses consideration pensare: nec tibi aliqua exulandi causa surriperet… sed tunc fortassis pro sola voluntate invidentium fugisse pudebit… et relicto hoste dilacerandas impiis oves tuas dimisisti. Prior Ernulf

Canterbury's most celebrated saint when placed in a similar situation may be an attempt to create this custom.

The case of Dunstan and the count is comparable to the example of Bishop Wilfrid defending himself against accusations of meddling in secular affairs, which has already been explored in this chapter. Wilfrid's defence is less obviously drawn from Anselm's own reasoning as this appears in his letters, partly due to Eadmer's use of a different Latin term for 'the law'. Nevertheless, Eadmer justifies both Dunstan and Wilfrid's actions by referring to God's law. Eadmer's use of Anselm's own language in the later *Vita Dunstani* may indicate that Eadmer had a fuller understanding of Anselm's defence at this later stage, or even that Eadmer had access to Letter 210.

The *Vita Dunstani* shows a progression from Eadmer's less sophisticated and less obvious allusions in the earlier *Vita Wilfridi*. Whereas in the *Vita Wilfridi* Eadmer merely reworked a section of reported speech to include an Anselmian defence, in the *Vita Dunstani*, the author constructs what seems to be an original scene, perhaps inspired by a brief comment in a source-text. However, despite this progression, Eadmer is using similar techniques, such as preferring reported speech and choosing very relevant episodes to make his references.

The *Vita Oswaldi*

The *Vita Oswaldi* is Eadmer's last major hagiographical work and contains a number of clear and extensive Anselmian references. As has been discussed, the text was written around 1113-4, and represents a clear evolution from Eadmer's earlier works. In the text of the *Vita Dunstani*, Eadmer rarely combines Anselmian vocabulary with an extensive incorporation of Anselmian ideas into his text. In contrast, when writing in the *Vita Oswaldi*, Eadmer often uses the correct Anselmian terminology in extended explorations of Anselmian

writes: If you had been eager to ponder on the rule of ecclesiastical administration and the order of ancient custom with anxious consideration, no reason would have deceived you into remaining in exile… you will feel ashamed of having fled… you abandoned your sheep to be torn apart by the ungodly. (Fröhlich's translation) Anselm omits these letters from his letter collection.

themes. For example, where Eadmer explains that the people of York wished for Oswald to become their archbishop, Eadmer writes:

> He (the king) asked them what they wanted [*uoluntas*]… there was an equal amount of love, harmonious opinion, and a single resolve [*uoluntas*] among the people in this good deed, and would the God of peace, who makes people of one mind to dwell in a house and is amongst two or three who have gathered in his name, not support a thing which such a great multitude supported, not feel what they felt, not desire what they desired? Clearly he too desired it. But let that rest. For whatever God wishes to happen must happen of necessity. However, he wants whatever his faithful want in accordance with his wishes. Otherwise they might well wish without him, and the truth [*ueritas*] would not speak true when it says no one can do anything without it. But in accordance with his desire, his faithful wishes that saint Oswald be made archbishop of York. And so because God wishes this same thing it was necessary in every way that it came about. Therefore Oswald trusted in God by trusting in the will [*uoluntati*] of God's servants. And so when he had been made archbishop of York…[75]

This excerpt displays theological ideas from Anselm's *Cur Deus homo*, from Anselm's other treatises exploring will and from Anselm's early letters. Eadmer combines several Anselmian themes into a piece of reasoning to justify Oswald's elevation by common acclaim of the people. The identification that all good action originated with God and that humans may only participate in it appears to be distinctively Anselmian.[76] The necessity of God's will is central

[75] *VO*, p. 262: Rogatur uoluntas illorum… per caritas, sententia concors, una uoluntas populi in bono fuit, et Deus pacis, qui inhabitare facit unanimes in domo, quique est inter duos uel tres congregatos in nomine suo, non faueret rei cui tanta multitude fauebat, non sentiret quod sentiebat, non uellet quod uolebat? Volebat plane. Sed esto. Quod Deus fieri uult, fiat necesse est. Vult autem quod secundum se uolunt fideles sui. Alioquin bene possent uelle sine illo, et ueritas non esset ueridica quae dicit nichil sine se quenquam posse. At secundum se uoluerunt fideles sui sanctum Osuualdum fieri pontificem Eboraci. Quoniam igitur hoc ipsum Deus uoluit, ut fieret necesse omnimodis fuit. Quapropter adquieuit ille Deo, adquiescendo uoluntati seruorum Dei.

[76] Anselm, *Monologion*, 4. Anselm, *Cur Deus homo*, I, 1. The convoluted section of wishing without truth may have been influenced by chapter 11 of *De casu diaboli* where Anselm explains that evil (defying God's will) signifies nothing. In the *Vita Oswaldi*, Eadmer suggests that there is no action (nothing) without participation in

to the *Cur Deus homo*. Further, Eadmer's word-play of 'truth not speaking true' is reminiscent of passages from *De veritate*.[77] By the writing of the *Vita Oswaldi*, Eadmer appears able to incorporate a number of ideas from numerous Anselmian texts, creating more complex and sophisticated allusions.

Anselmian references often reflect contemporary issues in Eadmer's textual register. This justification of election by unanimous acclaim could be related to Anselm's own election or to the near-contemporary 1114 election of Archbishop Ralph d'Escures. Eadmer wrote the *Vita Oswaldi* after the 1107 Concordat of London, where Henry I had agreed to surrender his right to invest bishops but retained significant influence over appointments.[78] This scene may act as a model for elections, wherein the king would use his influence to ensure that the candidate acclaimed by 'God's servants' was elected. Archbishop Ralph's election represented a compromise between Henry I, his bishops and magnates and the Chapter. Henry I's choice was his doctor, Faritius, but this election was opposed by the nobles and bishops, and Faritius did not have a close relationship with the Canterbury community.[79] By contrast, Ralph was administrator of the See of Canterbury and had been at Anselm's deathbed as one of his close personal friends. Eadmer's account of Oswald's election in the *Vita Oswaldi* may reference Ralph's own election, as in both cases the king listened to the wishes of others and did not force through a royal candidate. Eadmer may be using this scene to explain why the king should listen to common opinion: the king would be obeying the wishes of God.

It is possible that Eadmer may be paralleling Anselm's own election: in the *Historia* Anselm faced the unanimous voices of the bishops, who appear as the primary movers behind Anselm's elevation. However, given that the Anselmian references in the *Vita Wilfridi* and the *Vita Dunstani* seem to allude to contemporary issues, it seems more likely that Eadmer was referring to Archbishop Ralph's election.

---

truth – there is clearly sin, so it seems he must be referencing that evil does not exist as it lacks realness. Anselm, *Casu diaboli*, 11.

[77] Compare with chapters 9 and 10 of the *De veritate* where Anselm discusses the truth of signification. Anselm, *De veritate*, 9 & 10.

[78] W. Hollister, *Henry I* (London: Yale University Press, 2001), p. 210.

[79] Hollister, *Henry I*, p. 235.

Eadmer's *Prologues*

One particularly noticeable way in which Eadmer may have aligned his hagiographical texts with Anselm appears where Eadmer justified the writing of these texts. This trend is observable throughout Eadmer's hagiographical and historical writing, and therefore is relevant to texts explored in other chapters. In Eadmer's later texts, he is able to employ Anselm's own terminology in the *Prologues* to these works, drawing explicit Anselmian allusions. However, an early and rudimentary example may occur in Eadmer's *Vita Wilfridi*, which, although lacking in Anselmian terminology, may show a primitive effort to allude to Anselm's thought. This follows the general trend identified in this chapter, that Eadmer's *Vita Wilfridi* uses allusions in an experimental form, without the correct Anselmian language.

In the *Prologue* to the *Vita Wilfridi*, Eadmer appears to be drawing a comparison to the *Prologue* to Anselm's *Monologion*. In Eadmer's *Prologue*, he begins by describing the geographic location of British Isles and then comments on the troubles experienced by the English church. Most of this is taken from Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*: Eadmer uses the *Prologue* and the opening sections.[80] Following the section modelled on Bede, Eadmer outlines his sources and then writes:

> Wherefore, being mindful of what these writers have said in all respects, I trust that I shall say almost nothing which cannot be confirmed by their authority, nothing, to be sure, which may be wholly contrary to what they have said. Certainly, I pray that whoever deigns to read or listen to these things should understand that I have written them in this way, not as if I preferred what I have written to those, as it were, ancient versions, whatever they may be with respect to this matter, but rather that he should think that I wanted both to please my friends, who are asking it of me (as I have said),

[80] Bede, *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, eds. and trans. B. Colgrave & R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), chapter 1.

> and to show some indulgence of my love and, at the same time, reverence to this holy man of God.[81]

This appears to be an original addition by Eadmer, as this passage does not resemble a re-writing of Bede, unlike the previous parts of the *Prologue*.

Eadmer's *Prologue* may be alluding to Anselm's *Prologue* to the *Monologion* in two different ways. First, in the *Prologue* to the *Vita Wilfridi*, Eadmer's reason for writing is described as to 'please my friends'. The claim to be writing at the request of others also appears in the *Prologue* to Anselm's *Monologion*. In Anselm's own *Prologue*, he specifically identifies the brothers at his monastery as having requested the *Monologion*, writing:

> Certain brothers have frequently and earnestly entreated me to write out for them, in the form of a meditation, certain things… But at last, overcome by the modest insistence of their entreaties as well as by the commendable probity of their earnestness I began [to undertake] what they were entreating, [even though] I was [still] reluctant because of the difficulty of the task and the weakness of my intellectual power. But because of their love I gladly and to the best of my ability finished [it] in accordance with their prescription.[82]

Anselm discusses the request at some length, making it a central point of the introduction. Eadmer and Anselm do not share identical vocabulary in this case: Anselm identifies the 'fratres' at his monastery as having urged him to write, whereas Eadmer names his request

[81] *VW*, p. 13: Horum igitur dicta per omnia sequens, pene nichil quod eorum auctoritate roborari non possit, nichil autem ex toto quod contrarium sit, dicturum me fore confido. Sane quicunque hec uel legere uel audire dignatus fuerit, precor ut ista me non ita scripsisse accipiat, quasi antiquis, quecunque sunt hac de re, mea uelim scripta preferred; sed potius cogitet et amicis meis, me (ut dixi) rogantibus, morem gere, et sancto Dei aliquod obsequium mei amoris et reuerentie exhibere uolisse.

[82] Anselm, *Monologion*, Prologue: Quidam fratres saepe me studioseque precati sunt… Tandem tamen victus cum precum modesta importunitate tum studii eorum non contemnenda honestate… sicut sciebam eos velle quorum petitioni obsequi intendebam.

as coming from 'amicis meis'. However, given that friendship was a prominent theme in Anselm's letter collection, Eadmer's reference may relate to Anselm's thought.[83]

A second parallel between the *Prologue* to Eadmer's *Vita Wilfridi* and the *Prologue* to Anselm's *Monologion* may be Eadmer's mention of 'authorities', where Eadmer may have been intending to allude to Anselm's own similar discussion in the *Monologion*. In the *Vita Wilfridi*, Eadmer writes:

> Wherefore, being mindful of what these writers have said in all respects, I trust that I shall say almost nothing which cannot be confirmed by their authority [*auctoritate*], nothing, to be sure, which may be wholly contrary to what they have said… I have written them in this way… to please my friends, who are asking it of me (as I have said)…[84]

In this passage, Eadmer emphasises both that his text agrees with the authorities used and that the re-writing was according to the wishes of his friends. It is possible that Eadmer may be referring to his distortion of sources to promote the metropolitan rights of Canterbury.[85] Regardless of these wider intentions, this example resembles Anselm's own discussion in the

[83] For discussion of the theme of friendship in Anselm's writing, see: J. Haseldine, 'Love, Separation and Male Friendship: Words and Actions in Saint Anselm's Letters to his Friends' in *Masculinity in Medieval Europe* (London/New York: Longman, 1999), pp. 238-256. Vaughn has examined the place of women in Anselm's friendships – N. Vaughn, 'Saint Anselm and His Students Writing about Love: A Theological Foundation for the Rise of Romantic Love in Europe', in *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, 19:1 (2010), pp. 54-73 at. p. 56. She moves away from the more typical focus on male friendship as looked at by Southern and McGuire, but primarily focusses on his friendships with laywomen. Some, McGuire among others have suggested that the initial very fervent temper of Anselm's letters was moderated after the death of his pupil Osbern, due to the closeness of their friendship. B. P. McGuire, *Friendship and Community: The Monastic Experience, 350-1250* (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1988), p. 211.

[84] *VW*, p. 13: Horum igitur dicta per omnia sequens, pene nichil quod eorum auctoritate roborari non possit, nichil autem ex toto quod contrarium sit, dicturum me fore confido. Sane quicunque hec uel legere uel audire dignatus fuerit, precor ut ista me non ita scripsisse accipiat, quasi antiquis, quecunque sunt hac de re, mea uelim scripta preferred; sed potius cogitet et amicis meis, me (ut dixi) rogantibus, morem gere, et sancto Dei aliquod obsequium mei amoris et reuerentie exhibere uolisse.

[85] See: Southern, *Biographer*, p. 279.

Prologue to the *Monologion*, as well as Eadmer's parallel account of the writing of the *Monologion* in the *Vita Anselmi*.

In the *Prologue* to the *Monologion*, Anselm stresses that his text agrees with the teachings of the church fathers and that the unusual style is due to his brothers' demands:

> After frequently re-examining this treatise, I have not been able to find that I said in it anything inconsistent with the writings of the Catholic Fathers—especially with Blessed Augustine's writings… Now, whatever I have stated in this treatise I have stated in the role of one who by reflection alone investigates, and disputes with himself about, points which he had previously not considered— just as I knew was desired by those whose request I was endeavouring to oblige.[86]

In this case, Eadmer's language does not echo Anselm's, however, when Eadmer describes Anselm's composition of the *Monologion* in the *Vita Anselmi*, instead of repeating Anselm's own language, Eadmer refers to Anselm putting aside the 'authority of Holy Scripture [*auctoritate divinae scripturae*].[87] Although the *Prologue* to the *Vita Wildridi* does not duplicate Anselm's language from the *Monologion*, it does duplicate language from Eadmer's own interpretation of Anselm's *Prologue* (as is given in the *Vita Anselmi*).

Eadmer's addition of these two themes to his reworking of Bede's opening to the *Historia Ecclesiastica* is not identically modelled on Anselm's *Prologue* to the *Monologion*, however, there are shared themes, particularly when Eadmer's description of the *Monologion* in the *Vita Anselmi* is considered. However, the relevance of these themes become more significant when Eadmer's later writing is considered. When taken alongside Eadmer's later *Prologues*, which all contain far more explicit Anselmian allusions, Eadmer's additions in the *Vita Wilfridi* appear to be an early experiment with Anselmian themes.

Eadmer's reference to writing at the request of his friends reoccurs in the *Prologues* of his other hagiographical and historical works. The example in the *Prologue* of the *Vita*

---

[86] Anselm, *Monologion*, Prologue: Quam ego saepe retractans nihil potui invenire me in ea dixisse, quod non catholicorum partum et maxime beati Augustini scriptis cohaereat… sed prius libros praefati doctoris Augustini *De trinitate* diligenter perspiciat… sicut sciebam eos velle quorum petitioni obsequi intendebam.

[87] *VA*, I, xix.

Wilfridi does not employ distinctively Anselmian language, but nevertheless marks the first appearance of this justification (the *Vita Odonis* does not have a *Prologue*). The *Prologues* to the *Vita Dunstani*, the *Vita Oswaldi,* the *Vita Bregwine,* the *Vita Anselmi* and the *Historia* all contain similar justifications, where in every single case Eadmer stated that he was writing at the request of others. Further, in every one of these later cases, Eadmer uses distinctively Anselmian terminology, explicitly identifying that he was writing at the 'will' [*uoluntati*] of others.[88] Although an author specifying that he was writing at the request of others may be typical of this period, consistently using Anselmian language in this way is less typical. The example from the *Vita Wilfridi* may represent a very early stage of this theme, where Eadmer drew a parallel to the *Prologue* of the *Monologion* but did not employ the distinctive Anselmian terminology which appears in all of the later texts.

Eadmer incorporated Anselmian thought into his hagiographical texts in a variety of different ways, from remodelling the characters of his subjects and using Anselmian references to alluding to contemporary issues relevant to Canterbury archbishops. The Anselmian justifications in Eadmer's *Prologues* suggest that he saw his own writing as being affiliated with Anselm. There is also a clear progression in Eadmer's use of these allusions and in his originality, illustrated by the absence of Anselmian terminology in the earlier *Vita*

[88] *VD,* Prologue: Quia Deum in sanctis suis mirabilem prophetica voce laudare jubemur, eum in iis quae in sancto Dunstano primae metropolis Anglorum pontifice mirabiliter operari dignatus est, quo rumdam simplicium in bono fratrum non contemnendae uoluntati obtemperantes, usitato more loquendi styli officio laudare decrevimus, scriptis quae alio quodam elocutionis genere ipsa gesta commemorant sapientum considerationi relictis. *VO*, Prologue: Non parere autem uoluntati illorum nefas judico, cum ne sibi amicissimis scilicet meis me nolle gerere morem, tum ne, laesa conscientia sua, me erga sanctum Dei nullum habere opinentur amorem. Eadmer, *Vita Bregwine* in B. W. Scholtz, 'Eadmer's life of Bregwine, archbishop of Canterbury, 761-764', *Traditio* 22 (1966), pp. 127-48, at p. 137: Exordium propositi mei atque procursum quo de beato Breguino pontifice Cantuariorum scribere a quibusdam familiaribus meis rogatus institui gratie commendo spiritus sancti, orans ut sue largitatis abundantia que sunt dicenda revelat, et ad ea promenda cor meum et linguam iuxta placitum sue uoluntatis clementer aperiat. *VA*, I, Preface: Quos eo quod offendere summopere cavebam, dedi operam voluntati eorum pro posse morem gerere. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 1: Hoc igitur considerato, penes me statui ea quae sub oculis vidi vel audivi, brevitati studendo, styli officio commemorare, tum ut amicorum meorum me ad id obnixe incitantium voluntati morem geram, tum ut posterorum industriae, si forte quid inter eos emerserit quod horum exemplo aliquo modo juvari queat, parum quid muneris impendam.

Wilfridi, which appears more and more in Eadmer's later writing and particularly in the later *Vita Oswaldi*. Eadmer's hagiographical writing was derivative in nature, and the texts are not saturated with Anselmian references and themes in the way of the *Vita Anselmi* and *Historia*. However, Eadmer does appear to be subtly remoulding Canterbury's saints in the image of Anselm. The insertion of Anselmian reasoning in historic scenes, which were relevant to contemporary issues, may represent another layer of Eadmer's method of reading the present into the past.

Chapter 2: Eadmer of Canterbury's *Vita Anselmi*

Eadmer of Canterbury's incorporation of Anselmian themes into the *Vita Anselmi* presents his fullest exposition of Anselm's teachings on appropriate human behaviour. As Anselm's close friend and most dedicated advocate, Eadmer had access to Anselm's conversation, letter collection and the final forms of his theological and meditational writings. Eadmer's mediation of Anselm's thought into both the life and reported speech of the saintly figure depicted in the *Vita Anselmi* closely follows Anselm's teaching. This text maintains a singular vision of appropriate human behaviour which may have been shaped by Eadmer's careful selection of episodes from Anselm's life.

The degree to which the *Vita Anselmi* is a direct record of Anselm's life and teachings has been subject to extensive scholarly debate.[1] As the editor of the *Vita Anselmi*, Richard Southern contributed a great deal to this discussion. Southern's treatment of Eadmer was often rather critical, and in the 1963 *Biography*, Southern presented Eadmer as somewhat simple in nature, speaking of Eadmer's 'intellectual limitations' and of Eadmer 'sinking back into his more representative role'.[2] In this book, Southern discussed how Anselm's sermons (as reported in the *Anselmus de monte humilitatis* and the *Liber de Similitudinibus*) share

[1] This debate is often discussed in terms of Anselm's character, but is really a question of the accuracy of Eadmer's presentation of Anselm. Scholars have seen Anselm as either a paragon of mildness and virtue (Richard Southern) or a sly manipulator of his image (Sally Vaughn). This debate has focused on both the *Historia* and the *Vita Anselmi*, but often fails to differentiate Eadmer's presentation of his master from Anselm's character. See: Southern, *Biographer*, pp. 4, 77, 123, 140, 179-81, 199. Southern, *Portrait*, pp. 181-4, 189-90, 243. S. N. Vaughn, *The Innocence of the Dove and the Wisdom of the Serpent* (California, University of California Press: 1992). S. N. Vaughn, *Archbishop Anselm 1093-1109: Bec Missionary, Canterbury Primate, Patriarch of Another World* (Oxford: Ashgate Publishing, 2012), see especially where she addresses the dispute with Southern, pp. xv-xvi. To demonstrate the sort of character Vaughn attributes to Anselm, one may look no further than her suggestion that he was involved in an assassination of William Rufus (pp. 101-125). See the response, R. W. Southern, 'Sally Vaughn's Anselm: An examination of the foundations', *Albion* 20:2 (1998), pp. 181-204. S. N. Vaughn, 'Anselm: Saint and Statesman', *Albion* 20:2 (1988), pp. 205-220. A notable article where Vaughn focusses on Eadmer's distortion, albeit in regards to the *Historia novorum*: S. N. Vaughn, 'Eadmer's *Historia Novorum*: A Reinterpretation, *ANS* 10 (1987), pp. 259-289.

[2] Southern, *Biography*, p. 276.

similar wording and similes to the *Vita Anselmi*'s renderings of Anselm's discourses.[3] Using these similarities, Southern suggested that a great deal of the reported speech that Eadmer attributes to Anselm represents a reasonable rendering of Anselm's actual words.[4] Southern characterised Eadmer here as an 'exact observer' and differentiates the *Vita Anselmi* from Eadmer's other hagiographical texts, defining the *Vita Anselmi* as a work of intimate biography.[5]

The entirety of the *Vita Anselmi* has often been treated as a simple recording of events, particularly by Southern.[6] This may be partially due to Eadmer's repeated assertion that he is merely repeating his master's words, without embellishment: Eadmer claims the *Vita Anselmi* contains the simple 'truth'.[7] The strength of Eadmer's insistence coupled with the likelihood that Eadmer recorded Anselm's sermons may have formed the basis for many contemporary scholars' use of the *Vita Anselmi* as a very straight-forward text offering a reliable record of Anselm's life. Other commentators have seen the *Vita Anselmi* as more of a considered effort and have regarded the text as depicting an idealised version of Anselm's private life, but these are in the minority.[8]

Southern's view was that the *Vita Anselmi* is a 'record of Anselm's permanent interests and thoughts', and as such is rather more reliable than Eadmer's other major pieces of writing. In the 1990 *Portrait*, Southern discussed the limitations of the *Historia novorum in Anglia*. After stating that the *Historia* is an eye-witness account, he continued as follows:

[3] The *Anselmus de monte humilitatis* is a collection of twenty-one sermons or fragments compiled by Anselm's friend Alexander. An anonymous compiler created the *Liber de Similitudinibus*, a collection of Aselm's saying which was created at an uncertain date after Anselm's death, and was popular in west England, but not at Canterbury. The earliest Canterbury manuscript dates from the thirteenth century. See a survey, Southern, *Biography*, pp. 220-222.

[4] Southern, *Biography*, pp. 220-223.

[5] Southern, *Biography*, pp. 314-343. This is also reiterated in J. Rubenstein, 'Biography and Autobiography in the Middle Ages', in *Writing Medieval History* ed. N. Partner (2005), pp. 53-69.

[6] Southern, *Portrait*, pp. 329-333.

[7] *VA*, Preface, I, xxxv & II, lxxi.

[8] See: Vaughn, 'Eadmer's *Historia novorum*: a reinterpretation'.

> Why then can we not trust it? Partly because it does not offer, or pretend to offer, a complete account of Anselm's activities, and more important, because it is in some vital respects fundamentally misleading.

Southern commented that as the *Historia* was written after Anselm's death and bears 'the marks of retrospective reassessment', Anselm's letters are a far more reliable source: 'the most important corrective'. Despite this evaluation of the *Historia*, Southern exonerated the *Vita Anselmi* from any similar charges, arguing that this text serves as a second 'corrective' to the *Historia*.[9] When reviewing Eadmer's hagiographical works, Southern found that Eadmer was employing a similar authorial strategy of 'retrospective reassessment', and summarised Eadmer's approach as: 'He (Eadmer) read the present into the past and presented his idealised picture of the past as an object lesson to contemporaries'.[10] This assessment of Eadmer's approach to his hagiographical writing has been built on by the work of other historians.[11] Southern's general identification of Eadmer's habit of 'distorting' history in his hagiographical writing may explain partly why Southern differentiated the *Vita Anselmi* from Eadmer's other works of hagiography. Defining the *Vita Anselmi* as 'intimate biography' suggests that Eadmer was taking a fundamentally different approach when writing this text.[12]

Although there is evidence that Eadmer recorded Anselm's sermons, and inserted these recordings into the text of the *Vita Anselmi*, the majority of the text consists of a narrative of Anselm's life. This is not presented as being in the form of reported speech. Further to this, there is no real indication that Eadmer was taking a radically different approach to his customary style as an author when he wrote the *Vita Anselmi*. Although the text records contemporary events, this is also true of the 'misleading' *Historia*. The real

[9] Southern, *Portrait*, pp. 247-8. It may seem particularly unusual given Eadmer's statement that he intended the *Vita Anselmi* and *Historia* to be read together: why would he have taken a fundamentally different approach to writing each twin? In the *Preface* to the *Vita Anselmi*, Eadmer states that the two works were intended to complement each other. The *Vita Anselmi* was published after the *Historia* and hardly disagrees with events as they are presented in the *Historia.*

[10] Southern, *Biographer*, p. 284.

[11] P. Hayward, 'St Wilfrid Ripon and the Northern Church in Anglo-Norman Historiography', *Northern History* 49 (2012), pp. 11-35. P. Hayward, 'An absent father: Eadmer, Goscelin and the cult of St. Peter, the first abbot of St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury', *Journal of Medieval History* 29:3 *(*2003), pp. 201-218.

[12] Southern, *Biographer*, pp. 314-320. See also: Rubenstein, 'Biography and Autobiography in the Middle Ages'.

difference between the *Vita Anselmi* and Eadmer's other major hagiographical and historical works may simply lie in the lack of secondary evidence which would reveal where Eadmer might be 'reassessing' events in his customary method.

Eadmer's purpose may not have been to faithfully record his master's life, but instead to produce a work which could instruct others how to conform in their lives to Anselm's teachings, as this teaching was represented in his theology, letters and conversation. Eadmer selected and, conversely, suppressed themes and episodes to develop one simple, unchanging and coherent vision of the ideal saint. Aside from Anselm's conversation, Eadmer appears to be drawing heavily from Anselm's Letter 37, which is inserted into the *Vita Anselmi*. The inclusion of this letter may indicate its overall importance to the composition of Eadmer's text, and themes from the letter can be found throughout Eadmer's presentation of Anselm's life. Letter 37 may have been particularly representative of Anselm's conversation, but if so, it is curious that Eadmer chose to insert a large portion of this letter rather than replicating Anselm's discussion as is preferred elsewhere. The case that the *Vita Anselmi* represents an exposition of Anselm's perfected teachings rather than a simple recording of events is strengthened by points of discord between Eadmer's text and Anselm's letters, where Eadmer can be seen to adapt Anselm's early life to conform to the teachings of his later life. This chapter will present a new reading of Eadmer as an author working independently from Anselm, constructing an image of a saint within this text, as opposed to just recording events.

Anselm as Saint: the monk's love of God

In the *Vita Anselmi*, throughout the course of Anselm's monastic and episcopal career, Eadmer highlights both Anselm's adherence to the Benedictine Rule and his hatred of all worldly affairs, which is related to his monastic persona. Eadmer's picture of Anselm reflects themes from the latter's Letter 37, which was written to introduce a novice to the monastic life.

Eadmer repeatedly emphasises that Anselm's main and preferred preoccupation is the contemplation of God; this theme is consistent throughout the *Vita Anselmi*. An early

example appears where Eadmer describes Anselm's habits as a monk of Bec, reporting that he reflected on his decision to remain at Bec as follows:

> 'There I shall have rest, there God will be to me all in all, there His love will be the only subject of my contemplation, the blessed and unremitting memory of Him will there be my sweet solace and satisfaction.' These were his (Anselm's) thoughts, these his desires, these his hopes for the future.[13]

Eadmer describes Anselm as continuing to desire a lifestyle dedicated to the contemplation of God even as archbishop of Canterbury. Unlike in the cases of other subjects of hagiography, Eadmer does not depict Anselm's habits as adapting when he transitioned from a monastic to an episcopal role.[14] Eadmer explains that when Anselm was serving as archbishop, he committed the care of his household to the monk Baldwin: 'In this way he (Anselm) was able to hold himself aloof and give his mind to spiritual exercises and to contemplation.'[15] Anselm's unhappiness when his new duties distracted him from this contemplation is also described. During Anselm's exile, however, Eadmer shows how his master was able to resume his former habits when living at Liberi, Italy:

> He (Anselm) ordered his life therefore on the lines of his early routine before he became abbot, which he deplored more than ever having to give up since he became archbishop: day and night his mind was occupied with acts of holiness, with divine contemplation, and with the unravelling of sacred mysteries.[16]

Anselm is repeatedly depicted as desiring the time and space to contemplate God in peace, regardless of the expectations of Anselm's role. The excerpt above suggests that Anselm

[13] *VA*, I, v: Illic ergo requies mea, illic solus Deus intentio mea, illic solus amor ejus erit contemplatio mea, illic beata et assidua memoria ejus felix solamen et satietas mea. Haec cogitabat, haec desiderabat, haec sibi provenire sperabat.

[14] See especially: Dunstan acting vigorously at court with his kings: *VD*, pp. 78, 98.

[15] *VA*, II, xiii: Ita igitur securitate potitus, spiritualibus disciplinis et contemplationi operam dabat.

[16] *VA*, II, xxx: Ad primum igitur conversationis ordinem (quem antequam abbas esset habebat, quemque se in pontificatu positum maxime perdidisse defleba,) vitam instituit, sanctis operibus, divinae contemplationi, mysticarum rerum enodationi die noctuque mentem intendens.

preferred these monastic interests over the duties he was required to perform as archbishop, which are shown to be a distraction to Anselm's adherence a monastic lifestyle.

Comments regarding Anselm's on-going desire to apply his mind to the contemplation of God often appear alongside the theme of achieving quietness. Eadmer repeatedly associates a theme of the tranquillity or quietness of mind with the proper observation of the monastic life, and specifically with the ability to contemplate God. In two of the above cited excerpts where Anselm states his desire to contemplate God, Eadmer immediately continues by discussing Anselm's desire for tranquillity. After Eadmer explains that Anselm delegated the business of his household to Baldwin so Anselm could give his mind to spiritual exercises, Eadmer writes: 'Nevertheless various troubles and anxieties interrupted his (Anselm's) quiet [*quietem*] and forced him to think of other things.'[17] Similarly, where Eadmer describes Anselm's contemplation at Liberi, Eadmer then remarks that Anselm's 'spirits rose with the hope of future quiet [*quietis*]'.[18] This association between quietness and the proper observation of the monastic life also appears in descriptions of other characters in the *Vita Anselmi*, such as in the case of Boso. In this example, Eadmer gives an account of Anselm's role in Boso's conversion to the monastic life writing that after experiencing some difficulties, Boso 'was overtaken by such a tranquillity of mind [*tranquillitas mentis*]' and became a true monk.[19]

In the *Vita Anselmi*, these themes of the quietness of mind and the contemplation of God often appear alongside the common monastic metaphor which compares the course of a human's life to a ship traversing the sea. Eadmer explains that Anselm had difficulties adjusting when he became archbishop:

[17] *VA*, II, xiv: Verumtamen diversae tribulationes et anxietates… hanc ejus quietem interrumpebant, et aliena quaedam meditari compellebant.

[18] *VA*, II, xxx: Quod Anselmus advertens, ex spe futurae quietis.

[19] *VA*, I, xxxiv: Evestigio autem tanta tranquillitas mentis illum secuta est.

> When Anselm began now to think of all the peace [*quietis*] he had lost and all the labour he had found, his spirit was torn and tormented with bitter anguish… Thus he was tossed by the storms [*procellis*] of injuries of many kinds…[20]

The metaphor of the storm also appears in the account of Boso's conversion (mentioned above). In this example, Eadmer explains that after listening to Anselm's conversation, Boso wished to become a monk at Bec, but initially struggled:

> But the devil was filled with hatred at his (Boso's) conversion and at the manner of his life, and he swamped him in such a storm [*procellam*] of temptation that he could scarcely remain sane in all the many and carried tumults of his thoughts [*mentis*]…[21]

Eadmer's account then describes how Anselm helped Boso to conquer these troubles, whereupon Boso found his 'tranquillity of mind' [*tranquillitas mentis*] and became a true monk.[22]

Eadmer inserts just one letter into the text of the *Vita Anselmi*: Letter 37. This letter, written to Lanzo, a monk of Cluny, has been acknowledged as Anselm's most important letter regarding the monastic life.[23] In Letter 37, Anselm similarly associates the themes of contemplation, quietness and the metaphor of the storm. The inclusion of this letter in the *Vita Anselmi* may have been intended to establish that Anselm's own life (as depicted in the *Vita Anselmi*) was in conformity with his teachings.[24] Letter 37 describes the good monk:

---

[20] *VA*, II, viii: Considerans Anselmus post haec quid quietis perdiderit, quid laboris invenerit, anxiatus est spiritu, et vehementi dolore attritus… Multis itaque ac diversis injuriarum procellis fatigabatur.

[21] *VA*, I, xxxiv: Cujus conversioni simul et conversationi diabolus graviter invidens, in tantam illum tentationis procellam demersit, ut, succedendibus sibi variis cogitationum tumultibus, vix mentis suae compos existeret.

[22] *VA*, I, xxxiv: tranquillitas mentis.

[23] Letter 37 is partially incorporated into *VA*, I, xx. Anselm refers back to the letter later in his life, in Anselm, *Ep.* 335, he advises Warner, a monk of Christ Church Canterbury to read it. A number of scholars have acknowledged this letter as Anselm's most important letter on the monastic life – see Fröhlich's comment on the letter in his edition and Southern's identical comments in the translation of the *Vita Anselmi*, p. 32. *The Letters of Saint Anselm of Canterbury*, trans. W. Fröhlich, 3 vols. (Kalamazoo, Michigan: Cistercian Publications, 1990-4), vol. 3, p. 61.

[24] This may be highlighted by the fact that Eadmer begins the chapter directly following this letter with a statement that Anselm attempted to conform his own life to his teachings. See: *VA*, I, xxi.

> For he has been able to reach some sort of a port [*portum*] in which to shelter from the storms [*procellosis*] and tossings of the world: let him therefore beware of disturbing the tranquillity [*tranquillitatem*] of port [*portus*] with the wind of fickleness and the hurricane of impatience, and let his mind, lying at rest [*quieta*] under the protection of constancy and forbearance, give itself up to the fear and love of God in carefulness and sweet delight.[25]

In the letter, Anselm emphasises the importance of a 'quiet mind' and explains that this state cannot be attained without effort, patience and the observation of all the customs of a monastery. Although Letter 37 was written to instruct a novice in the nature of the monastic life, themes from this letter appear throughout the text of the *Vita Anselmi*. Moreover, the letter's image of the monk seeking a 'quiet mind' away from a storm is used not merely in the *Vita Anselmi* but in the life of Boso as well.[26]

There are further parallels between Letter 37 and accounts from the *Vita Anselmi*, apart from the themes of quietness of mind and the metaphor of the storm (just discussed). In this letter, Anselm warns against a monk desiring 'better [*meliora*] things' which may lead him ultimately to lose the holy manner of life which he has already achieved.[27] Directly after this warning, Anselm advises the reader to be patient, then proceeds to use the metaphor of the storm and to discuss the need for a quiet mind. Eadmer's description of Anselm's troubles as archbishop appear to be patterned on this discussion from Letter 37. After detailing Anselm's unhappiness as archbishop, Eadmer writes:

> When Anselm began now to think of all the peace [*quietis*] he had lost and all the labour he had found, his spirit was torn and tormented with bitter anguish. For he saw in his mind's eye the life which he had been accustomed to lead as prior and abbot… As a bishop he ought to have gone onto better [*melius*] things; but he saw his days

[25] *VA*, I, xx: Et quia ad qualemcunque portum de procellosis mundi turbinibus potuit pertingere, caveat in portus tranquillitatem ventum levitatis et impatientiae turbinem inducere: quatenus mens constantia et mansuetudine tutantibus quieta, divini timoris sollicitudini et amoris delectationi sit vacua.

[26] 'Vita Bosonis' in Migne, *PL*, vol. 150, CL, 723-32, at 723-726.

[27] *VA*, I, xx: Si autem vere meliora illis quae in promptu sunt nondum meritus optat.

> and nights taken up with secular business…Thus he was tossed by the storms [*procellis*] of injuries of many kinds…[28]

Anselm has lost, here, his quietness of mind (only found in a monastery) and is therefore unable to live a proper monastic life. The discussion of going 'onto better [*melius*] things' and the use of the metaphor of the storm is identical to Anselm's warning that change can disturb the tranquillity of a monk's life.[29]

Letter 37 outlines Anselm's conception of the monastic life. However, Eadmer presents Anselm as continuing to conform to this model after he became archbishop of Canterbury. Eadmer's use of themes from this letter to portray Anselm's difficulties as archbishop emphasises Anselm's monastic nature. The monastic lifestyle, therefore, appears central to Eadmer's conception of a saint, or at least to a monastic saint. This follows Anselm's own conviction that the single and only route to God is through persevering in a monastic life. In Anselm's letters, he repeatedly urges a variety of men, from laymen to hermits to give up their plans and join a monastery.[30]

Eadmer appears to have viewed Anselm's adherence to a monastic lifestyle as vital to his sainthood, with the episcopal role as being of secondary importance. In the *Vita Anselmi*, Eadmer comments on the unusualness of Anselm's lifestyle, reporting that as archbishop, Anselm cultivated: 'those virtues which were more fitting for a monk of the cloister than for the primate of so great a nation', which attracted widespread criticism.[31] Eadmer then explains how Anselm's mildness was often exploited by those 'on whom he ought to have

---

[28] *VA*, II, viii: Considerans Anselmus post haec quid quietis perdiderit, quid laboris invenerit, anxiatus est spiritu, et vehementi dolore attritus. Ducebat enim ante oculos suae mentis qualem in prioratu et abbatia positus vitam agere solebat… nunc e converso cum in melius per episcopatum proficere debuerit, ecce die ac nocte in saecularibus laborans videbat… Multis itaque ac diversis injuriarum procellis fatigabatur.

[29] *VA*, II, viii.

[30] Anselm, *Epp*. 15, 36, 44, 56, 81, 95, 112, 115, 117, 120, 121, 133. In addition, Anselm encourages others to permit those who want to become monks, see Anselm, *Epp.* 86 & 134.

[31] *VA*, II, xii: Unde etiam pro ipsarum indiscreta ceu nonnullis et mihi quoque aliquando visum est virtutum custodia saepe reprehensus, et quod monachus claustralis quam primas tantae gentis esse deberet, prejudicatus est.

inflicted ecclesiastical discipline'.[32] There is no suggestion that Anselm's monastic virtues were advantageous, or even suitable, for his episcopal role, but the text presents Anselm as a monk before all else. Anselm's inability to tolerate his episcopal duties may reflect their incompatibility with a vision of a proper monastic life.

The centrality of monasticism to Eadmer's depiction of Anselm may explain a number of elements in the narrative of the *Vita Anselmi*. In this text, Eadmer describes Anselm's consistent refusals to be promoted. This hatred of promotion does not appear to be drawn from the *Rule of St. Benedict* or from Gregory I's *Regula pastoralis*. Instead, it seems to reflect Anselm's own teachings from the Letter 37. The *Rule of St. Benedict* emphasises that the burden of abbot should not be taken up lightly, but does not include any expectation that an abbot-elect should be reluctant or attempt to refuse the position.[33] In the case of ecclesiastical advancement, reluctance was a prerequisite. *Regula pastoralis* encourages prospective clergymen to 'flee from this burden only out of humility'.[34] However, when elaborating on this requirement towards the end of chapter five, Gregory I clarifies:

> So, there are those who, endowed, as we have said, with great gifts, in their eagerness for the pursuit of contemplation only, decline to be of service to the neighbour by preaching; they love to withdraw in quietude [*quietis*] and desire to be alone for meditation. Now, if they are judged strictly on their conduct, they are certainly guilty in proportion to the public service which they were able to afford.[35]

[32] *VA*, I, xii: multi quos aecclesiastica disciplina corripere debuerat.

[33] St. Benedict, *Benedict's Rule*, ed. and trans. T. G. Kardong (Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1996), RB II.

[34] St. Gregory the Great, *Regula pastoralis*, eds. F. Rommel & R. W. Clement (Turnout: Brepols, 2010), Part 1:6: Quod hi qui pondus regiminis per humilitatem fugiunt, tunc uere sunt humiles. Gregory the Great, *Pastoral Care*, trans. H. Davis (Newman Press: New York, 1950) Part I:6.

[35] St. Gregory the Great, *Regula pastoralis*, eds. Rommel & Clement, Part 1:5: Sunt itaque nonnulli qui magnis, ut diximus, muneribus ditati, dum solius contemplationis studiis inardescunt, parere utilitati proximorum in praedicatione refugiunt, secretum quietis diligent, secessum speculationis petunt. De quo si disticte iudicentur, ex tantis procul dubio rei sunt, quantis uenientes ad publicum prodesse potuerunt. Gregory the Great, *Pastoral Care*, trans. Davis, Part I:5.

Eadmer's later descriptions of Archbishop Anselm's attitude towards his episcopal duties and desire for quietness so that he might contemplate God may appear to be slightly in tension with Gregory I's guidance.

Instead of conforming to the dictates of traditional texts, Anselm's reported fear of any promotion follows the teachings in his Letter 37. In this letter, Anselm recommends a style of monastic life which is unchanging. Anselm encourages Lanzo to find a monastery where he can 'spend his whole life', and warns him against seeking anything higher in case these efforts have a negative result.[36] Anselm alerts the novice monk to the temptations of the Devil, which may cause the novice to become ungrateful and experience a 'restless mind' [*mentis inquietudine*]. Anselm advises that remaining in a single place is preferable, and highlights the potential danger of changing location:

> The error, namely, of incurring all in vain the guilt of inconstancy or fickleness in changing the place or manner of his life without profit or actual loss; or that of attempting things above his strength and being forced to fall back wearied into his former ways or even something worse.[37]

This warning is associated with chapter one of the *Rule of St. Benedict*, which summarises 'The kinds of monks'.[38] This chapter particularly condemns the nomadic lifestyle of the gyrovagues, who are described as 'always wandering and never stable [*stabilis*]'.[39] Stability was a basic monastic value for St. Benedict, and is fundamental to chapter fifty-eight, which details the procedure for accepting new monks.[40] St. Benedict's emphasis is on the superiority of the coenobitic lifestyle when compared to other types of monks. Anselm has moved beyond this topic, and also warns novice monks of the dangers of ambition.

---

[36] *VA*, I, xx: sed voluntarium tota vita mansurum.

[37] VA, I, xx: ne sine emolumento, aut etiam cum jactura locum vel vitae ordinem mutando, inconstantiae levitatisque frustra crimen subeat, aut majora suis viribus experiendo fatigatus, deterius in priora, aut etiam in pejora prioribus deficiat.

[38] St. Benedict, *Benedict's Rule*, ed. and trans. Kardong, RB 1.

[39] St. Benedict, *Benedict's Rule*, ed. and trans. Kardong, RB 1: semper vagi et numquam stabilis

[40] St. Benedict, *Benedict's Rule*, ed. and trans. Kardong, RB 58.

The *Vita Anselmi's* account of Anselm's own life contains identical reasoning. Anselm's reported reservations when facing promotion to abbot are expressed using these themes from Letter 37. Eadmer explains how Anselm attempted to avoid becoming abbot of Bec and begged to be allowed to 'remain free of so great a burden' [*se a tanto onere quietum manere permittant*].[41] Anselm is shown to eventually yield to the entreaties of his monks, however Eadmer follows this by stating that Anselm: 'never on account of his abbacy abated anything of his former exercises in holiness', emphasising that Anselm's manner of life remained unchanged.[42] Eadmer only briefly mentions Anselm's refusal to be promoted to the position of archbishop. However, as already shown, the latter's warning manifests itself in Eadmer's depiction of Anselm's struggles when he accepts this promotion.[43]

The monk's singular focus on God and the associated quietness is associated, naturally enough, with contempt of the world. In the *Vita Anselmi* a pertinent example occurs after Anselm is promoted to prior, where Eadmer comments that Anselm redoubled his efforts to live correctly:

> Having thus obtained a larger liberty for the service of God, he began to devote his whole self and his whole time to serving God, and he put the world and all its affairs entirely behind him.[44]

This connection between devotion to God and contempt for the world is repeated constantly throughout the *Vita Anselmi*.[45]

This perceived relationship between dedication to God and rejection of the world presumably also lies behind Eadmer's portrayal of Anselm as unable to tolerate the demands of secular business as either abbot or archbishop. If Eadmer's vision of living a life devoted to God encompassed a rejection of all worldly affairs, then Anselm's continual struggles with his episcopal duties were a natural consequence of mixing the two spheres. Throughout the

[41] *VA*, I, xxvi.

[42] *VA*, I, xxvi: nunquam de retroacta sanctitatis suae conversatione causa abbatiae aliquid minuit.

[43] *VA*, II, ii. As is described in the *Historia novorum in Anglia* and in Anselm, *Ep.* 149, from Osbern.

[44] *VA*, I, vii: sicque Deo serviendi ampliore libertate potitus, totum se, totum tempus suum in illius obsequia expendere, saeculum et cuncta negotia ejus ab intentione sua, funditus coepit amovere.

[45] For example, *VA*, II, xiii.

description of Anselm's career, Eadmer demonstrates Anselm's disinterest in secular business.[46] As abbot of Bec, Eadmer comments that Anselm preferred to delegate the business of the monastery to others so he could be free to contemplate God and correct his monks.[47] Similarly, when Anselm first meets King William Rufus (as abbot), Eadmer reports:

> He (Anselm) put aside the business of the monastery, which was supposed to be his chief reason for coming there, and began to rebuke the king for those things which were reported about him.[48]

Even where secular business was a necessary part of Anselm's role, he is shown to naturally prefer to focus on services to God and neighbour.

Eadmer greatly expands on Anselm's aversion to secular business when Anselm becomes archbishop, augmenting this theme by suggesting that Anselm found his secular duties to be so intolerable that they were dangerous to his physical health: 'useless uproars, controversies and altercations' could make him seriously ill. However, Anselm's friends learned that he could be easily revived with talk of Holy Scripture, which Eadmer calls 'a wholesome antidote'.[49] Eadmer reports that Anselm himself explained why he fell ill when dealing with secular business:

> When asked why he was so weak and faint-hearted in secular business, he replied: 'Long ago I drove all love and cravings for secular things from my mind. How then shall I now be strong and diligent in attending to them? I tell you the truth without a lie in saying that, when these affairs press importunately and inescapably upon me, my mind is seized with a horror of them…[50]

---

[46] *VA*, I, xxvii & II, I, viii, xiii, xiv, xxx.

[47] *VA*, I, xxvii.

[48] *VA*, II, i: Omissis igitur monasterii sui causis, pro quibus maxime illuc venisse putabatur, regem de his quae fama de eo ferebat Anselmus arguere coepit.

[49] *VA*, II, xiii: Si vani clamores, si contentiones, si jurgia… salubri antidoto.

[50] *VA*, II, xiii: Requisitus autem quamobrem sic imbecillis ad saeculares causas ac pusillanimis existeret, respondebat: Qui omnem saecularium rerum amorem ac concupiscentiam ab animo meo jamdudum pepuli, qualiter in causis earum fortis et diligens existam? Imo veritatem dico, non mentior, quia quando ipse mihi sese importune et ex necessitate ingerunt, ita mens mea illarum horrore concutitur.

Eadmer concludes this chapter by explaining that Anselm decided to delegate the care of his household to the monk Baldwin and 'give his mind to spiritual exercises and to contemplation'.[51] Anselm's reported explanation makes it clear that his aversion to secular business was a consequence of his monastic vocation; the solution was to focus Anselm's mind on spiritual affairs, such as Holy Scripture or contemplation.

The commentary of Anselm's troubles with secular business when serving as archbishop may lead a reader to assume that Anselm's distaste for these duties could be due to their taxing nature. However, Eadmer employs similar vocabulary and themes when describing Anselm's experiences in the world, regardless of whether the experience is positive or negative. Early in the text, Eadmer describes Anselm enjoying living in the world as a layman:

> The ship of his heart had as it were lost its anchor and drifted almost entirely among the waves of the world. But Almighty God, foreseeing what he was going to make of him, stirred up for him a hateful and domestic strife, lest in enjoying a transitory peace he should lose his soul.[52]

This passage, which employs the same metaphor of the world as the sea, implies that any enjoyment of a transitory peace or of living in the world is inappropriate. The repeated use of the metaphor of the storm may suggest that the account of Anselm's reaction to worldly business is not necessarily a reflection of its tiresome nature, but an expression of its fundamental incompatibility with the idealised monastic lifestyle and enjoyment of 'quietness' in one's port. Anselm's reported hatred is, in this sense, a natural consequence of Anselm's dedication to God and the monastic way.

When creating this narrative of Anselm's total rejection of the world, Eadmer may have consciously omitted Archbishop Anselm's occasionally successful support of William Rufus. Both the *Vita Anselmi* and the *Historia* largely omit the period between May 1095- May 1097, despite the fact that Eadmer was probably with Anselm during this period. In Anselm's

[51] *VA*, II, xiii: Ita igitur securitate potitus, spiritualibus disciplinis et contemplationi operam dabat.

[52] *VA*, I, iv: Defuncta vero illa, illico navis cordis ejus quasi anchora perdita in fluctus saeculi pene tota dilapsa est. Sed omnipotens Deus praevidens quid de illo facturus erat, ne animam suam pace transitoria potitus perderet, infestum ei et intestinum bellum generavit.

Letter 191, written to Cardinal Walter in June 1095, Anselm states that he cannot leave Canterbury because he is guarding the coast against an expected invasion close to the city.[53] In this letter, Anselm remarks that he will wait for the return of the king, and then at a favourable moment raise the issue of church reform. There is no suggestion in this letter that Anselm found these duties impossible or burdensome to carry out. Although Anselm may not have mentioned any distaste for his duties to Cardinal Walter, it is notable that Eadmer has chosen to omit Anselm dutifully guarding the coast for his king, or any other similar duties of a secular nature performed in this period.[54] The relationship between the archbishop and king may have been cordial for periods around this time. In a July/August 1095 letter, Anselm asked for prayers to be said for the king, praising William Rufus' 'prudence and vigour' and describing the king's troubles as due to the wicked envying the good.[55] Eadmer's exclusion of any mention of Anselm's successes in secular duties in these periods where he was enjoying good relations with the king, however motivated, serves to create a coherent narrative, where themes reoccur across the text.

Eadmer's focus on human devotion and the importance of quiet for the contemplation of God shares themes with Anselm's theological writing. In the *Monologion*, Anselm argues that only the rational mind is able to investigate God. Anselm writes:

> Yet, [the rational creature] cannot love the Supreme Being without striving to remember it and to understand it. Clearly, then, the rational creature ought to devote his entire ability and his entire will to [the end of] remembering, understanding, and loving the Supreme Good—to which end he knows that he has his existence.[56]

For Anselm a central duty of the human being was to use his/her rational mind to meditate on God, regardless of the limitations of the human ability to understand God. Presumably, this is a universal expectation of humanity and would apply to a human regardless of whether

[53] Anselm, *Ep.* 191.

[54] Anselm's letter is business-like in tone, and there is no mention of his feelings on this matter. Eadmer excludes this episode, nonetheless.

[55] Anselm, *Ep.* 190: prudentiae et strenuitati.

[56] Anselm, *Monologion*, 68: Amare autem eam nequit, nisi ejus reminisci, et eam studuerit intelligere. Clarum est ergo rationalem creaturam, totum suum posse et velle ad memorandum, et intelligendum, et amandum summum bonum impendere debere, ad quod ipsum esse suum se cognoscit habere.

he is a monk or an archbishop. In this interpretation of human life, God expect would all humans to live a monastic lifestyle, regardless of duties or station.

The correct and proper state of mind of an individual is a central theme in the *Vita Anselmi*. Eadmer presents the use of reason as the proper application of the rational mind, stating: 'For to be moved by reason is a sign of strength, but the contrary is a sign of weakness'.[57] In the text, the use of reason by secondary characters is consistently shown in a positive light. For example, Anselm's mother, Ermenberga, who appears at the opening of the *Vita Anselmi*, is described as 'upright and blameless and in a true sense guided by reason'.[58] This follows themes from Anselm's theological writing: Anselm discusses the importance of rationality and its particular significance to the human being in chapters 66-68 of the *Monologion*.[59]

Reason is also presented in the life as being the source of Anselm's exceptional abilities to understand and interpret the meaning behind scripture. Eadmer writes about Anselm's scholarly mediation as follows:

> Hence he (Anselm) applied his whole mind to this end, that according to his faith he might he found worthy to see with the eye of reason those things in the Holy Scriptures which, as he felt, lay hidden in deep obscurity.[60]

Eadmer's depiction of reason as informing scholarship follows a theme from Anselm's theological writing. In the *Prologue* to the *Monologion*, Anselm explains that his intention is to describe the essence of the divine using reason alone instead of relying on Holy Scripture.[61] Anselm states this purpose with no implication that reason is superior to Scripture, or that the proper use of reason would contradict Scripture. Reason appears as merely an alternative approach. Eadmer's limitation of 'according to his faith' also mirrors Anselm's own writing on

[57] *VA*, I, xxxiii: Ratione siquidem agi virtutis est, vitii vero contra.

[58] *VA*, I, i: Mores erant probi et irreprehensibiles, ac juxta rectam considerationem ratione subnixi.

[59] Anselm, *Monologion*, 66-68.

[60] *VA*, I, vii: Quapropter summo studio animum ad hoc intenderat, quatenus juxta fidem suam mentis ratione mereretur percipere, quae in ipsis sensit multa caligine tecta latere.

[61] Anselm, *Monologion*, Prologue.

the relationship between reason and understanding; Anselm explains his own approach as 'faith seeking understanding'.[62]

In the *Vita Anselmi*, Eadmer's depiction of Anselm's use of reason is not restricted to his speculative theology, but extends to his pastoral theology and preaching. Eadmer insists that Anselm's preaching was both inspired by and based on reason, in a way which appears to follow Anselm's approach to theology. In book I Eadmer explains that Anselm was: 'guided by his power of discrimination [*discretionis ratione*], he so understood the character of people of whatever sex or age', and then ascribes the success of Anselm's preaching to this ability to understand people.[63] Discretion is a common attribute of successful monastic and ecclesiastical leaders and is particularly discussed in Gregory I's *Regula pastoralis*.[64] However, Eadmer's particular association of discretion with reason differentiated his treatment of this topic from that of others. Eadmer further distinguishes Anselm's preaching from that of his contemporaries by explaining that the content of Anselm's preaching was also based on reason:

> And when we say that he admonished, or instructed, or taught these things, he did it not as others are wont to teach, but far differently; he set forth each point with familiar examples in daily life, supporting them with the evidence of solid reason, and leaving them in the minds of his hearers, stripped of all ambiguity.[65]

Therefore, Eadmer depicts Anselm's preaching as being derived from reason in two ways: Anselm uses reason to adapt his preaching to the characters of others and the content of this preaching was also based on reason.

This type of approach mirrors Anselm's approach to theological topics. As already discussed, in the *Monologion* Anselm states his intention as to investigate the topic of God

---

[62] Anselm, *Proslogion,* Preface: fides quaerens intellectum

[63] *VA*, I, viii: Hinc perspicaciori interius sapientiae luce perfusus, mores omnis sexus et aetatis ita discretionis ratione monstrante penetravit, ut eum palam inde tractantem, adverteres cuique sui cordis arcana revelare.

[64] St. Gregory the Great, *Regula pastoralis*, eds. Rommel & Clement, Part 3:1.

[65] *VA*, I, xxxi: Haec autem quae eum vel admonuisse, vel instruxisse, vel edocuisse dicimus, non eo ut aliis mos est docendi modo exercebat, sed longe aliter singula quaeque sub vulgaribus et notis exemplis proponens, solidaeque rationis testimonio fulciens, ac remota omni ambiguitate, in mentibus auditorum deponens.

using reason alone.[66] The apparent irregularity of Anselm's method attracted criticism from others and in particular from Archbishop Lanfranc.[67] Anselm ignored Lanfranc's disapproval, and instead used the *Prologue* to deflect criticism of the text for being 'too modern' or deviating from 'the writings of the Catholic Fathers'.[68] In the *Vita Anselmi*, Eadmer accurately presents Anselm's attitude towards theology, but also suggests that Anselm widened this approach to his preaching.

Anselm as Saint: the monk's love of Neighbour (in God's name)

Contemplation and the love of God is clearly a major theme in the *Vita Anselmi*. Encompassed within this vision of the love of God is the love of one's neighbour. Where Eadmer discusses Anselm's desire to contemplate and love God, this author then often elaborates on Anselm's charitable or religious services towards other human beings. Eadmer makes it clear that Anselm's love for others derives purely from his desire to serve God, rather than from any concern for social relationships. Eadmer also differentiates God and the associated love of neighbour from 'the world'. An example appears in Book II, where Eadmer writes: 'He (Anselm) saw himself unable to devote his attention either to God or to his neighbour in God's name as he had formerly done…'[69] This passage (cited earlier in this

[66] Anselm, *Monologion*, Prologue.

[67] Anselm, *Ep.* 72 & Anselm, *Monologion*, Prologue. Southern pointed out that Anselm's terms of address to Lanfranc changed after their disagreement over the work. We do not have Lanfranc's response to Anselm, but Anselm published the Monologion and did not bother to send Lanfranc future works for comments. Cowdrey has suggested that the break took place before this: H. Cowdrey, *Lanfranc: scholar, monk, Archbishop* (Oxford: Oxford University press, 2003). Sweeney identifies the clash with Lanfranc, but sees Anselm as aligning his will with Augustine when his will clashes with Lanfranc's: E. C. Sweeney, *Anselm of Canterbury and the Desire for the Word* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 2012), pp. 60-63. Southern, *Portrait*, pp. 60, 65-66, 119-122, 127.

[68] Anselm, *Monologion*, Prologue: non catholicorum Patrum, et maxime beati Augustini, scriptis cohaereat … quod aut nimis novum sit…

[69] *VA*, II, viii: et nunc e converso cum in melius per episcopatum proficere debuerit, ecce die ac nocte in saecularibus laborans videbat se nec Deo nec proximo secundum Deum juxta pristinum morem intendere posse.

chapter in relation to the distinction between God and the world) highlights Anselm's perception of his devotion towards God and that this included love of neighbour.

Eadmer depicts Anselm repeatedly discussing the heavenly reward he expects to receive for this inter-personal charity. The extract quoted above which describes Anselm's unhappiness as archbishop continues as follows: 'and he saw no-one willing to listen to the Word of Life from his lips or to carry it out; and thereby he lost (as he thought) his reward'.[70] Earlier in the text, Eadmer had recorded a sermon on the topic of love, which Anselm reportedly gave to the monks of Canterbury on the occasion when Anselm and Eadmer first met. Eadmer describes this sermon as follows:

> He (Anselm) began by expressing his thanks, and continued in the same address to speak of charity, explaining and proving that he who loved another possesses something greater than he who is the object of this love. 'For he who has love,' he said among other things, 'has something for which God rewards him; but this is by no means true of the man who is merely the recipient of love.[71]

Eadmer continues, explaining how mutual love can increase the size of this reward:

> Moreover, if from this service I grow in love towards you, this also will be added to the sum of your reward, that you have done something which had produced so much good in me. And if I do not grow in love, your love nevertheless remains with you, while the service you had paid me passes from me utterly.[72]

This conception of inter-personal love creates a model where both the lover and the recipient of love can be moved towards God through their mutual love. The giver of this idealised love

---

[70] *VA*, II, viii: nec adeo quemquam ex ore suo verbum vitae quod facto impleret, ad suae, ut reputabat, detrimentum mercedis, audire velle.

[71] *VA*, I, xxix: postmodum ipsi monachorum conventui a gratiarum actione inchoans, procedente in hoc verborum serie de charitate locutus est, rationabiliter ostendens eum qui charitatem erga alterum habet, majus aliquid habere, quam illum ad quem charitas ipsa habetur: ipse enim inter alia, inquit, qui charitatem habet, hoc unde Deus ei scit gratias habet; ille vero ad quem tantummodo habetur, minime.

[72] *VA*, I, xxix: Adhaec si ex ipso officio circa vos aliquid charitatis in me crevit, et hoc ipsum vobis ad cumulum retributionis erit, qui fecistis unde mihi tantum bonum provenit. Si non vobis tamen charitas vestra remansit, a me officium quod exhibuistis penitus transit.

receives a heavenly reward owing as a result of their love for another person. If the giver's love incites a return love, the first person may receive an additional bonus for inciting goodness in the recipient of love. This vision has the potential to form a relationship where the mutual love which exists between two people can continually grow and produce rewards from God, perhaps exponentially. Eadmer's presentation of inter-personal love, therefore, presents a vision of love which in theory, could drive two people towards their salvation.

The appearance of love in the *Vita Anselmi* finds anchor-points in the presentation of love in Anselm's own writing, where he establishes inter-personal love as an extension of the love that should exist between God and man. In the *Proslogion*, when approaching God through contemplation, Anselm surveys 'the kinds… of good for those who enjoy this (Good)':[73]

> For through Him they [shall love] Him and themselves and one another; but He [loves] Himself and them through Himself. [74]

Similarly, in his *Oratio pro amicis,* Anselm states that the reason why he endeavours to love all men is only because this is God's commandment.[75] The correct form of man's inter-personal love appears included as part of a human's expected obedience to God. In Anselm's writing, correctly-ordered love between humans is a principal goal of human existence. Achieving or progressing towards this state whilst on earth can drive a giver of love to God. In a letter written to Hugh the Hermit, Anselm discusses this inter-personal love:

[73] Anselm, *Proslogion*, 25: *Quae et quanta bona sint fruentibus eo.*

[74] Anselm, *Proslogion*, 25: quia illi illum et se et incivem per illum, et ille se et illos per seipsum.

[75] Anselm of Canterbury, 'Prayer for Friends' *in The Prayers and Meditations of Saint Anselm with the Proslogion*, trans. B. Ward (Suffolk: Penguin Books, 1973), lines 27, 40-41. Anselm, *Oratio pro amicis*: Est autem praeceptum *tuum* ut diligamus invicem… diligens omnem hominem in te et propter te, quamvis non quantum debeo, nec quantum.

> Moreover, since reigning in heaven is nothing but being so welded in love into one will with God and all holy angels and men… If, therefore, you will to be king in heaven, love God and men as you should and you will deserve to be what you choose.[76]

Anselm's writings, therefore, depict correctly-ordered inter-personal love as being for the sake of God, and as having the potential to bring the giver of love closer to his salvation and to God. The discussions of love in Anselm's meditational and theological texts are complex. Although Anselm's explanation of the correct form and end of inter-personal love is almost indistinguishable from Eadmer's own in the *Vita Anselmi*, Eadmer's representation successfully simplifies the subject, without deviating from Anselm's teachings.

Throughout the *Vita Anselmi*, Eadmer continually demonstrates Anselm's love for all other people, even for those who are his enemies or who hate him. Eadmer's presentation of Anselm's love conforms to the supposition in the Canterbury sermon that the giver of love is rewarded even if this love is not requited or does not bring about good works in the recipient of the love.[77] In the *Vita Anselmi*, there are numerous cases of Anselm loving those who are purported to hate him. One example occurs in book one where Eadmer gives an account of Anselm providing care and counsel to a dying monk who reportedly hates [*odio*] Anselm. After listening to Anselm's conversation, the monk dies apparently reconciled to Anselm.[78] Another character who Eadmer records Anselm persisting in loving despite receiving only hatred in return is William Rufus: Eadmer reports that that when Anselm heard of William Rufus' death, the archbishop 'burst into bitter tears':[79]

---

[76] Anselm, *Ep.* 112: Denique quoniam regnare in caelo non est aliud quam sic conglutinari cum deo et cum omnibus sanctis angelis et hominibus per dilectionem in unam voluntatem… si ergo vis esse rex in caelo, ama deum et homines sicut debes, et mereberis esse quod optas.

[77] *VA*, I, xxix.

[78] *VA,* I, xv: Praeterea quidam ex antiquioribus ipsius coenobii fratribus, qui veteri odio plurimum erat infestus Anselmo, nec ullatenus poterat super eum respicere simplici oculo, infirmitate pressus ad extrema perductus est.

[79] *VA*, II, xlix: mox est in acerbissimum fletum concussus.

> He (Anselm) declared, in words broken with sobs, that if it had been possible he would much rather that his own body had died than that the king had died in his present state.[80]

The insistence on Anselm's intense love for all others, regardless of their sinfulness, reinforces the importance of this obligation to love all others. Anselm expresses a similar expectation in his *Oratio pro inimicis*, outlining the requirement to love even those who hate the giver. In this prayer, Anselm asks: 'for those who serve with me and hate me – let us love you and each other'.[81] Eadmer's report of Anselm's claim that he would rather have suffered death than the king had died in such a state may bear further comparison with the *Oratio pro inimicis.* In this prayer, Anselm similarly relates his enemies' fates to his own, writing: 'Whatever you (God) make me desire for my enemies, give it to them and give the same back to me…'.[82] This theme, expressed both in Eadmer's *Vita Anselmi* and Anselm's *Oratio pro inimicis*, is likely to be related to wider notions about the interchangeable nature of human souls. Anselm draws on this idea elsewhere, such as in his letter defending the sinner Moses, where Anselm uses a clever metaphor of substituting his own skin for Moses' in an attempt to persuade the community not to punish the runaway.[83]

Anselm is also shown to be the recipient of love from many others, as they were naturally attracted to his holy persona. Eadmer suggests that Anselm's mild character and his ability to co-operate with other people are the principal reasons for this love, writing:

---

[80] *VA*, II, xlix: At ille singultu verba ejus interrumpente, asseruit quod si hoc efficere posset, multo magis eligeret se ipsum corpore, quam illum sicut erat mortuum esse.

[81] Anselm of Canterbury, 'Prayer for Enemies' in *The Prayers and Meditations of Saint Anselm with the Proslogion*, trans. B. Ward (Suffolk: Penguin Books, 1973), lines 63-4. Anselm, *Oratio pro inimicis*: Haec est poena quam orat anima mea de conservis et inimicis meis, ut te et invicem, sicut tu vis et nobis expedit, diligamus.

[82] Anselm, *Oratio pro inimicis*: quidquid ipse facis me desiderare inimicis meis, et illis tribue, et mihi retribue.

[83] Anselm, *Ep.* 140.

> From this example may be known how much gentleness and discretion he showed towards all men. In matters like this he was indefatigable; in such ways he served God and made himself beloved by all good men.[84]

Eadmer's claim that Anselm's agreeableness inspired love from others is repeated throughout the *Vita Anselmi*. At one point, Eadmer compares Anselm to the Pope, commenting that although the Pope was reverenced by everyone, Anselm 'was loved by all as a mild [*mansuetus*] and gentle [*mitis*] man'.[85] This particular quality may at first appear as being innate to Anselm's character, but Eadmer makes it clear that Anselm deliberately cultivated this agreeableness in a conscious effort to acquire the love of others:

> To return however to the favour which he found among men, I do not think that those who knew his way of life will wonder at the charming sweetness which proceeded from his conversation wherever he was, and drew all men to him in friendship and affection. For it was always his aim with all men, to do that which he understood to be most agreeable to others.[86]

Eadmer follows this passage with a report of Anselm urging his monks to co-operate with others, making it clear that this agreeableness was conscious on the saint's part.

The mirroring of Anselm's thought on inter-personal love in Eadmer's discussion also appears with respect to the letter collection. For example, in an early letter written to Odo and Lanzo, Anselm offers the letter as a sign of his love in an attempt to incite love in return, writing:

---

[84] *VA,* I, xxii: Haec idcirco diximus, quatenus per haec quam piae discretionis et discretae pietatis in omnes fuerit agnoscamus. Talibus studiis intendebat, in istis Deo serviebat, per haec bonis omnibus valde placebat.

[85] *VA*, II, xxxiii: Papa namque colebatur a cunctis, quemadmodum pater et pastor communis; Anselmus vero diligebatur ab omnibus, sicut homo mansuetus et mitis, et cui suo judicio nihil debebatur a quovis.

[86] *VA*, I, xxxiii: At tamen de gratia quam meruerat apud homines, non multum his qui mores illius novere mirandum video, propterea quod quaedam appetibilis suavitatis ubicunque erat ex conversatione ejus emergebat, quae in amicitiam illius ac familiaritatem cunctos agebat. Ipsuis etenim studii semper erga omnes extiterat, ut ea potissimum ageret, quae aliis magis commoda esse posse intelligebat.

> Whereas true love honourably bestowed demands to be loved blamelessly in return, I do not consider myself shameless if I display my love for you to some extent either to gain yours for me or, having gained it, to render it more perfect.[87]

Anselm's own writing on the subject, therefore, mirrors Eadmer's presentation from the *Vita Anselmi*.[88]

Elsewhere in this text, Eadmer suggests that Anselm's tolerant nature and leniency is related to a desire to fall in with the wills of others. Directly following the above excerpt, where Eadmer describes that it was Anselm's aim to be agreeable to all men, the author then outlines Anselm's reasoning:

> 'Whoever tries to fall in with the will of others in all good purposes merits this reward from God, the just Judge: that as he has been in harmony with the will of others in this life, so in that other life God and everything about him will be in harmony with his will.'[89]

The need for humans to 'fall in with the will of others' is a central theme in Anselm's letter to Hugh the Hermit. In this letter, Anselm progresses from discussing the mutual love which ought to exist between the members of a monastery to describing how this mutual love can produce a mutual will. Anselm argues that this mutual will is pleasing to God:

> For so great shall be the love between God and those who shall be there (in heaven), and between themselves but all shall love God more than themselves. And because of

[87] Anselm, *Ep.* 2: Quoniam verus amor, sicut laudabiliter impenditur, sic irreprehensibiliter amando exigitur, puto me impudentem non esse, si meum erga vos aliquatenus vobis ostendo amorem, ut vestrum mihi possim aut acquirere aut acquisitum reddere perfectiorem.

[88] Anselm references this himself in Letter 156, where he states that 'I have lived… in such a way that all good people who know me love me…' Anselm, *Ep*. 156: Sic enim vixi iam per triginta tres annos in habitu monachico… ut omnes boni me diligerent qui me noverunt.

[89] *VA*, I, xxxiii: Qui aliorum voluntati concordare per omnia in bono nititur, hoc apud justum judicem Deum meretur, ut quemadmodum ipse aliorum voluntati in hac vita, ita Deus et omnia secum suae voluntati concordent in alia vita.

> this, no one there shall will anything but what God wills; and what one wills, all shall will; and what one or all will, this shall God himself will.[90]

Both Anselm's letters and Eadmer's *Vita Anselmi* depict a relationship between mutual love and mutual will.

Eadmer openly states that Anselm was willing to deviate from the expected behaviour of an abbot in order to achieve the goal of mutual wills. Following the above excerpts where Eadmer suggests that Anselm attempted to be agreeable to others, Eadmer continues:

> Fortified therefore by the consideration of this argument [*rationis*], it was Anselm's wish to be harsh or burdensome to no-one, even if he had on this account somewhat to temper the austerity of the monastic rule [*monachicae institutionis*]. And he did indeed sometimes temper that severity for the sake of others, being led to do so by a wise discretion. What others may think about this who may read or hear of it in the future cannot be foretold. But to us, who had the good fortune to know his manner of life, it appears more worthy of praise in him that he sometimes for a reasonable [*ratione*] cause descended from the rigour of his profession, than if he had held to it stiffly and without discretion.[91]

The 'monachicae institutionis' mentioned in this intriguing passage almost certainly refers to the Rule of St. Benedict. This section presents the application of reason [*rationis*] as carrying more importance than the strict enforcement of monastic tradition, which elevates Anselm's theological perceptions over conformity to authorial texts. This follows the earlier discussion where Eadmer depicts Anselm's refusal to be promoted using Anselm's own teachings on the dangers of change to a monastic life, rather than relying on the traditional guidebooks.

---

[90] Anselm, *Ep.* 112: Tanta enim erit dilectio inter deum et eos qui ibi erunt et inter se ipsos invicem, ut omnes se invicem diligant sicut se ipsos, sed omnes plus ament deum quam se ipsos. Et propter hoc nullus ibi volet nisi quod deus; et quod unus volet, hoc volent omnes; et quod unus vel omnes, hoc ipsum volet deus.

[91] *VA,* I, xxxiii: Hujus igitur rationis Anselmus consideratione subnixus, nulli gravis, nulli volebat onerosus existere, etiam si a monachicae institutionis austeritate hac de causa deberet aliquantulum temperare. Et quidem ut eum discretionis ordo docebat, nonnunquam ab ipsa severitate aliis condescendo temperabat. In quo quid hi sensuri sint qui post nos ista fortasssis lecturi vel aduituri sunt, praescire non possumus. Nos tamen qui vitae illius modum scire meruimus, magis in eo laudandum aestimamus, quod a rigore sui propositi aliquando pro ratione descendebat, quam si continue in ipso rigidus indiscrete persisteret

Anselm's habit of moderating the dictates of the Rule appears elsewhere in the *Vita Anselmi*, and on one occasion Eadmer emphasises that Anselm never sinned as a result of his leniency.[92]

In the *Vita Anselmi*, Eadmer often records how Anselm repays the evilness of others with good. In book I, Eadmer explains that when Anselm was prior of Bec, some of the senior monks were envious of his advancement. Eadmer reports Anselm's conduct as follows:

> Being thus upset, they upset others; they spread scandal, they made dissensions, they formed cliques and fostered hatred. But to those who hated peace, he showed himself peaceful. He repaid their detractions with the offices of brotherly charity, preferring to overcome evil with good, rather than, in wrong-doing, to be overcome by their wickedness.[93]

This theme of overcoming evil with good reoccurs elsewhere in Anselm's behaviour, such as when he was archbishop. When Anselm's mild nature was reportedly taken advantage of by his own men, Eadmer explains that Anselm 'had no inclination to repay with evil the evil they had done to him'.[94]

The importance of combating evil with good is significant in Anselm's theological and meditational writing. In the *Proslogion*, where Anselm is meditating on God's treatment of the wicked, Anselm discusses God's mercy towards evil men. Anselm explains that God can only return good for man's evil as this is the 'better' thing to do:

> For someone who is good both to those who are good and to those who are evil is better than someone who is good only to those who are good. And someone who is good by virtue of both punishing and sparing those who are evil is better than

[92] *VA*, I, x.

[93] *VA*, I, ix: Itaque turbati, aliosque turbantes, scandala movent, dissensiones pariunt, sectas nutriunt, odia fovent: at ipse cum his qui oderunt pacem, erat pacificus, et detractionibus eorum reddebat officia fraternae charitatis, malens vincere malitiam in bono, quam a malitia eorum vinci in malo.

[94] *VA*, II, xiv: Siquidem illi certo scientes eum pro malis sibi illatis ad mala reddenda cor non habere.

> someone who is good by virtue merely of punishing [them]… And so, in this way, it is just that You spare those who are evil and that You make good men from evil ones.[95]

Anselm also includes this theme in his *Meditatio ad concitandum timorem*, writing: 'He returned to me good for evil and I have repaid him with evil for good'.[96] As the nature of God represents the ultimate good and is something which human beings ought to emulate, Eadmer's presentation of Anselm's efforts to return good for evil is consistent with Anselm's theological teachings.

It is possible that this principle of replaying good for evil, as depicted in Eadmer's narrative, may be related to Anselm's practice of discipline. In one of the two cases mentioned earlier, in the matter of the envious Bec monks, Eadmer reports that Anselm's strategy is successful in reforming the culprits:[97]

> In this purpose, by God's mercy, he succeeded, inasmuch that they – perceiving that he walked purely and innocent in all his ways and that there was nothing in him for which he could rightly be reproached – changed their evil intention to a good one…[98]

An association with the topic of discipline is highlighted by Eadmer's introduction of the correct application of discipline directly after this discussion about Anselm's dealings with the jealous monks. However, it is notable that in the case of the unscrupulous men at Canterbury who take advantage of Anselm's mild nature (mentioned above), Anselm's behaviour has the

[95] Anselm, *Proslogion*, 9: Melior enim est qui et bonis et malis bonus est, quam qui bonis tantum est bonus; et melior est, qui malis et puniendo et parcendo est bonus, quam qui puniendo tantum… Hoc itaque modo justum est ut parcas malis, et ut facias bonos de malis.

[96] Anselm of Canterbury, 'Meditation 1' in *The Prayers and Meditations of Saint Anselm with the Proslogion*, trans. B. Ward (Suffolk: Penguin Books, 1973), lines 83-85. Anselm, *Meditatio ad concitandum timorem*: qui mihi bonum pro malo reddidit, cui ego malum pro bono.

[97] *VA*, I, ix.

[98] *VA*, I, ix: Quod, miserante Deo, factum est, siquidem illi animadvertentes eum omnimodis pure ac simpliciter in cunctis actionibus suis incedere, neque quod jure blasphemari posset in illo residere, mala voluntate in bonam mutate.

opposite effect.[99] Therefore, as Anselm is shown to apply this approach of replaying good for evil regardless of its effect on sinners, this expectation may also exist independently of discipline.

Nevertheless, the use of good to overcome the wickedness is others is central to Anselm's application of discipline. In Eadmer's record, Anselm's practice deviated from that of his contemporaries, and may represent an alternative interpretation of the guidelines in the Rule of St. Benedict. Eadmer demonstrates the workings of Anselmian discipline in the case of the promising but unruly young monk Osbern, a case which was briefly mentioned in chapter one of this thesis. In a lengthy description, Eadmer explains that Anselm initially flattered his young charge and tolerated the boy's childish pranks. After securing the boy's friendship and affection, Anselm began to verbally and even physically discipline the young monk, who corrected his behaviour in response.[100] Further to this example, Eadmer reports details of Anselm's debate with a fellow abbot concerning the more effective application of discipline. In this recording, Anselm berates an abbot who has been beating his oblates in futile attempts to obtain their obedience. Eadmer gives details on Anselm's advice to the abbot to be more sympathetic and affectionate in his dealings with the young monks, specifically urging the abbot to apply encouragement and gentleness, especially to those who are badly behaved.[101] Eadmer continues, explaining the reasoning behind Anselm's approach:

> The strong soul delights in and is refreshed by solid food, but as patience in tribulation, not coveting one's neighbour's goods, offering the other cheek, praying for one's enemies, loving those who hate us, and many similar things. But the weak soul, which is still inexperienced in the service of God, needs milk, - gentleness from others, kindness, compassion, cheerful encouragement, loving forbearance, and much else of the same kind.[102]

---

[99] Eadmer reports that as a result of Anselm's actions, the men at Canterbury 'cast off all fear and went from bad to worse, excelling themselves in wrong-going'. *VA*, II, xiv: a timore suspensi sibique ipsis deteriores effecti, in pejus profecere.

[100] *VA*, I, x.

[101] *VA*, I, xxii.

[102] *VA*, I, xxii: Fortis anima delectatur et pascitur solido cibo, patientia scilicet in tribulationibus, non concupiscere aliena, percutienti unam maxillam praebere alteram, orare pro inimicis, odientes diligere, et

It is interesting that Anselm's position on this topic is in opposition to that of the second abbot, which may suggest that Anselm's attitude towards discipline was unusual.

In the case of the young monk Osbern, Eadmer emphasises that Anselm initially made concessions to the young man 'so far as was possible without detriment to the Rule', placing Anselm's approach firmly within an interpretation of the Rule.[103] However, Anselm's reported displeasure at the unnamed abbot's harsh treatment of the 'incorrigible ruffians' inside his abbey may highlight Anselm's unusual reading of the text.[104] The Rule specifically instructs abbots on the topic of discipline, and in chapter two, directs readers as follows: 'Thus he (the Abbot) should discipline the unruly and restless rather sharply, but entreat the obedient, mild and patient to make more progress.'[105] Anselm's urgings for the abbot to refrain from severity does fit with the Rule's emphasis on discretion, but is not a standard reading of the advice on discipline. This represent another case where Anselm may have tempered the dictates of the Rule, prioritising the application of discretion over an uncompromising enforcement of monastic rubric.[106]

This report of Anselm's approach to discipline in the monastery finds corollaries in the leaner evidence in Anselm's letter collection. In one case, Anselm writes to Prior Henry in Canterbury regarding the runaway monk Moses. In this letter, Anselm pleads with the brothers not to beat Moses on his return to the monastery.[107]

Besides Anselm's conviction of the need to cultivate a loving persona and to return good for evil, there are further elements of his reported attitude towards discipline which may have originated in his own theological writing. In Eadmer's account of Anselm's rebuke to the unnamed abbot who was brutalising his young monks, part of the exchange is recorded as follows:

---

multa in hunc modum. Fragilis autem, et adhuc in Dei servitio tenera, lacte indigent, mansuetudine videlicet aliorum, benignitate, misericordia, hilari advocatione, caritativa supportatione, et pluribus huiusmodi.

[103] *VA*, I, x: multa nisi quae sine ordinis detrimento tolerari poterant concedere.

[104] *VA*, I, xxii: perversi sunt, et incorrigibiles.

[105] St. Benedict, *Benedict's Rule*, ed. and trans. Kardong, RB II: id est indisciplinatos et inquietos debet durius arguere, oboedientes autem et mites et patientes.

[106] *VA*, I, xxii.

[107] Anselm, *Ep.* 140.

> 'But what can we do about it?' he (the other abbot) said; 'We use every means to force them to get better, but without success.' 'You force them?... But you so terrify them and hem them in on all sides with threats and blows that they are utterly deprived of their liberty [*libertate*].'[108]

In Eadmer's account, Anselm uses a metaphor of a growing tree to convince the abbot that his application of discipline is encouraging them into wickedness. The language employed suggests that Anselm's reported objection to the other abbot's attempts to 'force' his monks to correct their behaviour is related to Anselm's discussion of willing rightly and of liberty. In the *De libertate arbitrii*, Anselm argued that God has given every rational creature the liberty to will correctly; Eadmer's use of the Latin term *libertate* may suggest a link to ideas in this treatise.[109] Anselm discusses this topic further in the sister text *De veritate* and argues that if a rational creature wills something good out of any compulsion, this is not willing rightly.[110] In chapter twelve of this second text, Anselm gives the example of a thief being forced to return money he has stolen, reasoning that a 'good' action performed out of coercion cannot please God.[111]

If this logic is applied to the examples discussed from the *Vita Anselmi*, the unnamed abbot's attempts to 'force' his charges to alter their behaviour could be seen as pointless, regardless of any effect. Even if the young monks had complied, the abbot's coercion would have meant that their good conduct would not bring any reward from God, either for themselves or for their abbot.[112] In the case of Osbern, Eadmer explains that Anselm 'saw

---

[108] *VA*, I, xxii: Et nos, ait, quid possimus inde? Modis omnibus constringimus eos ut proficiant et nihil proficimus. Constringitis?... Vos autem intantum terroribus, minis, et verberibus undique illos coarctatis, ut nulla sibi penitus liceat libertate potiri.

[109] Anselm, *De libertate arbitrii*, 2 & 3.

[110] Anselm, *De veritate*, 12: Justus namque, cum vult quod debet, servat voluntatis rectitudinem non propter aliud, inquantum justus est, quam propter ipsam rectitudinem. Qui autem nonnisi coactus, aut extranea mercede conductus, vult quod debet (si servare dicendus est rectitudinem) non eam servat propter ipsam, sed propter aliud. (Hopkins and Richardson's translation - By contrast, someone who wills what he ought to will but does so only if compelled to or only if induced by external rewards, does not keep uprightness-of-will for its own sake but keeps it for the sake of something else).

[111] Anselm, *De veritate*, 12.

[112] This assumes that Anselm's theories about love, are applicable in this situation. See: *VA*, I, xxix.

that he could confidently rely on the firmness of the young man's intent' before Anselm is shown to punish Osbern, either with words or blows.[113] The crucial difference between the use of punishment in these two cases may be in the attitude of the subjects. Anselm is shown to coax Osbern towards refashioning his life apparently out of his own choice, whereupon Anselm then begins to apply verbal and physical punishment. By comparison, the unnamed abbot attempts to force his charges to will correctly. Given Eadmer's portrayal of Anselm taking the same approach towards both his scholarly work and his preaching, the appearance of a theological theme in Anselm's expressed discussion on discipline may be unsurprising.

One implication which emerges from Eadmer's depiction of discipline and inter-personal relations is that love naturally encourages the growth of love and hatred tends towards inciting hatred. Eadmer frequently demonstrates that displays of love from Anselm incite love in others: many examples have already been cited in this chapter. However, Eadmer also suggests that the converse is true: that hatred towards others encourages their hatred. In Eadmer's account of Anselm's advice to the unnamed abbot, Anselm explains that the abbot's difficulties with his monks are partly resulting from their perception of the abbot's hatred towards them, arguing:

> 'Hence, feeling no love or pity, good-will or tenderness in your attitude towards them, they have in future no faith in your goodness but believe that all your actions proceed from hatred and malice against them. The deplorable result is that as they grow in body so their hatred increases together with their apprehension of evil, and they are forward in all crookedness and vice.'[114]

This vision of the reciprocal nature of both love and hate may be related to ideas in Anselm's theological and meditative writing. Many of Anselm's treatises and prayers are primarily intended to move the reader towards a love of God. This is most clearly stated in the *Proslogion*, where after explaining his single argument for the existence of God, Anselm then

[113] *VA*, I, x: ergo ubi de firmitate boni studii adolescentis se posse confidere animadvertit.

[114] *VA*, I, xxii: fit, ut quia nihil amoris, nihil pietatis, nihil benevolentiae, sive dulcedinis circa se in vobis sentiunt, nec illi alicujus in vobis boni postea fidem habeant, sed omnia vestra ex odio et invidia contra se procedere credant. Contingitque modo miserabili, ut sicut deinceps corpore crescunt, sic in eis odium et suspicio omnis mali crescat, semper proni et incurvi ad vitia.

meditates on God's love, drawing the reader to a greater love and appreciation of God. In the last chapter of the text, Anselm writes:

> O God, I pray, let me know and love You, so that I may rejoice in You. And if I cannot in this life [know, love, and rejoice in You] fully, at least let me advance day by day until the point of fullness comes. Let knowledge of You progress in me here and be made full [in me] there. Let love for You grow [in me here] and be [made] full [in me] there, so that here my joy may be great with expectancy and there may be full in realization.[115]

Anselm's texts often meditate on God's greatness and love for mankind, using this to incite greater love for God in the reader. Anselm's view of love as being both linear and potentially exponential may have helped form Eadmer's presentation of love increasing love and hate causing further hatred.

One of the most frequently reoccurring themes in Eadmer's account of Anselm's life is that of moderation, a theme which has already surfaced in the discussion of discipline and austerity. Moderation is crucial to Eadmer's presentation of other aspects of Anselm's life, such as in the consumption of food and the application of fasting. In Book I, Eadmer initially comments on Anselm's eating habits as follows:

> For what should I say about the fasts of one who from the time when he became prior so emaciated his body with fasting that not only from this time were all the lusts of the belly utterly extinguished, but even as he used to say, neither hunger nor pleasure in eating were induced by any amount of abstinence? Of course he ate like other men, knowing that his body could not be supported without food, but he ate most sparingly.[116]

---

[115] Anselm, *Proslogion*, 26: Oro, Deus, cognoscam te, amem te ut gaudeam de te. Et si non possum in hac vita ad plenum, vel proficiam in dies, usque dum veniat illud ad plenum; proficiat hic in me notitia tui et ibi fiat plena; crescat amor tuus, et ibi sit plenus ut hic gaudium meum sit in spe magnum et ibi sit in re plenum.

[116] *VA*, I, viii: Quid namque de illius jejunio dicerem, cum ab initio prioratus sui tanta corpus suum inedia maceraverit, ut non solum omnis illecebra gulae penitus in eo postmodum exstincta sit, sed nec famem sive delectationem comedendi pro quavi abstinentia, ut dicere consueverat, aliquando pateretur. Comedebat tamen ut alii homines, sed omnino parce, sciens corpus suum sine cibo non posse subsistere.

Later in Book II, Eadmer details Anselm's attitude towards the food consumption of others, writing:

> If he saw anybody eating hastily because he was waiting, or perhaps leaving his food, he used to reprove them and affectionately urge them to look after themselves without any hesitation. On the other hand, if he saw any of them enjoying their food, he would give them a friendly and cheerful look, and, full of pleasure, would raise his right hand a little, blessing them and saying 'May it do you good.'[117]

Other examples in the *Vita Anselmi* show Anselm being 'plied' with bread by his dining companions and Anselm expressing a particular longing for partridge when he fell ill.[118] Eadmer twice emphasises that Anselm ate 'sparingly', but in general, Anselm is not portrayed as a stern advocate of fasting in this text.[119] The excerpt detailing Anselm's treatment of others at his dining table may highlight this point: Anselm 'reproves' his companions if they leave their food. Further to this, food consumption appears to be associated with health, as seen in Eadmer's comments that Anselm sought to support his body and wished others to benefit from their food.[120]

Eadmer's exploration of Anselm's views on fasting follow the view expressed in Anselm's letters, if marginally tempered. There is evidence in Anselm's letter collection that Anselm was criticised by his contemporaries for being insufficiently austere in enforcing fasting. In Letter 49, written to Lanfranc, Anselm was forced to answer to a charge of laxity relating to his relaxation of the rigour of fasting. Specifically, Anselm replied to Lanfranc's request that Anselm openly state that his views on fasting were in conformity with general

---

[117] *VA*, II, xi: Quod si aliquem cerneret aut pro sui exspectatione celerius comedentem, aut forte cibum relinquentem, utrumque redarguebat, et quo suo commodo nihil haesitantes operam darent, affectuose admonebat. Ubi autem aliquos libenter edentes advertebat, affabili vultus jucunditate super eos aspiciebat, et adgaudens levata modicum dextra benedicebat eis, dicens: Bene faciat vobis!

[118] *VA*, II, xi, lvii.

[119] *VA*, I, viii: sed omnino parce, II, xi: parce quidem.

[120] Food items appear elsewhere in the *Vita Anselmi*. Bread is mentioned several times at the start of the *Vita Anselmi* and is associated with spirituality; God gives Anselm bread during his vision of the mountains and when exhausted crossing the alps, Anselm's servant miraculously finds some bread to refresh his master. *VA*, I, ii, iv. In addition, the finding of trout and sturgeon are presented as being miraculous. *VA*, I, xvii, xviii.

Christian teaching: the more a monk abstained from food, the greater the reward he gained.[121] The very fact that Lanfranc requested Anselm 'publish a statement of the truth' implies that there was contemporary discussion or rumour to the effect that Anselm was not convinced of the merits of imposing fasting.[122] Elsewhere in Anselm's letter collection, his aversion to immoderate fasting is evident.[123] One case of Anselm's open disapproval of over-zealous fasting occurs in Letter 196, written to Richard monk of Bec. In this letter, Anselm exposits the greater merits of obedience over fasting, explaining that 'obedience can save a man without this sort of fasting; without obedience such fasting can only lead to damnation'. [124] Anselm then warns: 'You… burden the abbot you are under and the brothers…It is quite clear that your body and your character cannot tolerate what your imprudence presumes to do.'[125] There is also an intriguing comment that Anselm fears Richard is seeking to 'gain a reputation or empty prestige' through his fasting.[126] In this letter, Anselm appears to view immoderate fasting as a self-indulgent recklessness which can cause unnecessary alarm for a community.

Anselm takes a similar approach when writing in other letters. In Letter 446, Anselm advises Gosfrid to mitigate his austerity if this at all endangers his health.[127] Further to this, in Letter 243 Anselm answers to Queen Matilda's concerns that he is being too rigorous with his own fasting: the Queen fears that it may be affecting Anselm's abilities to carry out his

[121] See Anselm, *Ep.* 49 and discussion by Southern in footnote to book I, chapter xxxiii of the *Vita Anselmi*.

[122] Anselm himself refers to this 'statement of truth' that Lanfranc has requested. Anselm, *Ep.* 49: Quod autem praecipitis, ut circa quasdam non meas, nec alicujus Christiani assertiones, simpliciter quam me scitis tenere, veritatis sententiam proferam, gratissime accipio, et libentissime obedio.

[123] In one letter Anselm directly advises his successor at Bec to: 'Hasten then to show yourself moderate in everything you do…'. Anselm, *Ep*. 165: Sic que te in omnibus quae agis moderatum exhibere festines.

[124] Anselm, *Ep*. 196: Sine huiusmodi enim abstinentia potest oboedientia hominem salvare; sine oboedientia vero talis abstinentia non valet nisi damnare.

[125] Anselm, *Ep*. 196: Et abbatem sub quo es et fratres inter quos vivis tua indiscretion gravare. Nimis enim patet quia corpus tuum et natura tua tolerare nequit, quod indiscretione tua praesumit.

[126] Anselm, *Ep*. 196: praemium seu potius famam.

[127] Anselm's emphasis is clearly on physical health. See: Anselm, *Ep.* 446: Hoc itaque quod facitis, quamdiu cum salute corporis vestri facere potestis, tenete. Si autem senseritis quod in aegritudinem vobis vertatur: tunc consulo ut, sicut expedire cognoscetis, vos temperetis.

work.[128] Anselm's answer is very short, and he prefaces it with a statement that he has 'voice and strength… sufficient for the work laid upon me', then responds: 'I can and intend, when I ought, to give my body as much nourishment as is expedient'.[129] This is a clear statement that Anselm believed that he was not being over-rigorous in his fasting, and the use of 'when I ought' and 'expedient' suggests that Anselm saw that there was a fitting amount to eat to sustain a person's body for their work.

These examples do not suggest that Anselm preached against fasting, and in his letter to Richard, Anselm mentions the 'common practise' of fasting, which he appears to recommend.[130] In Letter 243, to the Queen, Anselm explains that:

> Since you hear that I feel no hunger after a whole day's fast, even if it happens daily, you fear that hoarseness of my voice or bodily weakness may befall me... Even though I may be able to fast without pangs of hunger...[131]

What Anselm appears to be condemning are individuals who, through self-will, go beyond the common practice and may cause problems for their peers, superiors and even risk their own health. Anselm's letter to the Queen emphasises that his ability to perform his duties was not reduced by his fasting and that he was eating 'when he ought'. This may have acted as a defence against any charge of immoderate fasting.

Eadmer's presentation of Anselm's attitude towards fasting is particularly interesting because of the evidence that Anselm had been criticised by his contemporaries for not enforcing rigorous fasting. The early comment that Anselm 'emaciated' himself stands in opposition to Anselm's attitude towards food which is expressed elsewhere in the *Vita Anselmi*. In general, meal-times appear as important settings for spiritual discussion and social

---

[128] Anselm's Letter 243 is a reply to a letter from Queen Matilda (*Ep.* 242), which expresses her concerns about Anselm's fasting, mentioning that she had heard that Anselm would only eat after a member of his household had asked him to. Anselm also mentions Matilda's complaints about Anselm's 'lack of moderation' in Letter 329, but in regards to political matters. Anselm, *Epp*. 242, 243, 329.

[129] Anselm, *Ep.* 243: Quantum vox et vires quas habeo, ad opus mihi iniuunctum sufficerent… Sati stamen possum et volo, cum debeo, quantum expedit corpus alimentis recreare.

[130] Anselm, *Ep.* 196: communem usum.

[131] Anselm, *Ep.* 243: Nam quoniam auditis me pro ieiunio totius diei, etiam si cotidie fieret, famem non sentire, timetis raucitatem et imbecillitatem mihi corporis evenire… Licet enim sic possim sine famis molestia ieiunare.

bonding with friends, and Anselm is shown to be pleased when others enjoy their food.[132] The presentation of Anselm's dinner table as a place of lively spiritual discussion, the affectionate encouragement of others and his own reported frequent 'carelessness' with his food when engaged in debate appears to concord with Anselm's primary focusses of contemplating God, displaying love for others and giving good counsel. It is not difficult to see how Anselm might have viewed the social environment of a meal as offering the ideal setting to gently correct others and to develop mutual love with his friends.

The chapter where Eadmer comments on Anselm's 'emaciated' frame as prior contains a great number of characteristic behaviours of good priors, such as the correction of books and not sleeping before matins, none of which become important tenets of Anselm's lifestyle.[133] Considering that Eadmer was not an eye-witness during this period, this passage may act to represent Anselm's conformity to existing models of good monastic practise. It is clear across Eadmer's works that he was sensitive to contemporary criticism of Anselm. The nuanced portrait of Anselm in the *Vita Anselmi*, which advocates for Anselmian practises whilst generally emphasising that Anselm was conforming to the *Rule of St. Benedict* may reflect Eadmer's attempts to at once refute these criticisms and promote the merits of Anselmian moderation. The odd early appearance of Anselm as 'emaciated' may act as a counter-balance to later depictions of Anselm's relationship with fasting and food consumption, which appear to correspond with the evidence from Anselm's letter collection.[134]

[132] *VA*, II, xi: Quod si aliquem cerneret aut pro sui expectatione celerius comedentem, aut forte cibum relinquentem, utrunque redarguebat, et quo suo commodo nichil haesitantes operam darent, affectuose admonebat.

[133] *VA*, I, viii.

[134] Although Eadmer's discussion of these practises emphasises that Anselm was acting within the boundaries of the Rule, elsewhere in the *Vita Anselmi*, as has already been discussed, Eadmer admits that at times Anselm tempered the austerity of the Rule, which may hint at Anselm's generally looser interpretation of the Rule's instructions. Eadmer's following comment that he is uncertain what others would think of this moderation suggests a possible expectation or even the real existence of criticism by those who may have seen Anselm's methods as amounting to a misreading of the Rule.

Alfege and Anselm

One notable case where Eadmer incorporates Anselmian thought into the *Vita Anselmi* is in the account of Anselm's defence of the Anglo-Saxon saint Alfege.[135] Alfege and Osbern's composition of the *Vita Alfege* will be discussed at length in chapter four of this thesis. In summary, Alfege's case for sanctity rested on his refusal to be ransomed to marauding Vikings for money. In the *Vita Anselmi*, Eadmer explains that Lanfranc had been sceptical of this claim to sanctity until Anselm constructed a defence which successfully persuaded Lanfranc that Alfege was worthy to be venerated as a saint. Eadmer then claims (inaccurately) that as a result, Lanfranc ordered the writing of the *Vita S. Alfege*.[136] The debate over Alfege's sanctity probably took place at the king's court, Eadmer was unlikely to have been present, and the text gives no indication that he witnessed the debate. The account of the defence in the *Vita Anselmi* contains a great deal of detail and reported speech and is probably a recording of a later recollection of the affair, perhaps from Anselm or from others who were present at the debate.

This account of Anselm's defence of Alfege foreshadows Eadmer's portrayal of Anselm's case against William Rufus: Eadmer draws a parallel between Alfege and Anselm's situations, using identical language to highlight an apparent similarity. In Eadmer's recording of Anselm's defence, Eadmer reports why Alfege refused to co-operate with the Vikings:

> This man (Alfege) they not only number among the saints, but even among the martyrs, although they do not deny that he was killed, not for professing the name of Christ, but because he refused to buy himself off with money. For – to use the words of the English themselves – when his foes, the pagan enemies of God, had captured him, out of respect for his dignity they gave him the possibility of buying himself off, and demanded in return an immense sum of money from him. But since he could only have obtained this by despoiling his own men [*nisi homines suos eorum pecunia*

[135] *VA*, I, xxx.

[136] Only the hymn was written at Lanfranc's order. The life was later - Osbern mentions that Lanfranc ordered the writing of the hymn, but that the life was written for other reasons. *Vita S. Alfege*, p. 26.

> *spoliaret*] and possibly reducing some of them to a wretched state of beggary, he preferred to lose his life rather than to keep it on such conditions.[137]

This explanation becomes central to Anselm's own refusal to comply with William Rufus' demands, as depicted in the *Vita Anselmi*. In Book II, Eadmer describes Anselm's case:

> But then the king's mind was turned against him (Anselm), at the instigation of the devil and of evil men, because he refused to despoil his tenants [*eo quod ipse spoliatis hominibus suis*] in order to give the king £1000 as a thank-offering for his munificence.[138]

Eadmer uses parallel terms to justify the two men's refusals to co-operate when facing demands for money. Similar language also appears the *Historia novorum in Anglia* where Eadmer describes the dispute between Anselm and William Rufus. In this second text, Eadmer reports that Anselm refuses to co-operate:

> There is this too; my men [*homines mei*] since the death of my predecessor, Lanfranc of revered memory, have been robbed and stripped [*spoliati*] and should I, finding them unclothed, when as yet I have contributed nothing to reclothe them strip [*spoliarem*] them bare, or rather, being already stripped, flay [*spoliatos*] the very skin off their backs?[139]

---

[137] *VA*, I, xxx: Hunc non modo inter sanctos, verum et inter martyres numerant; licet eum non pro confessione nominis Christi, sed quia se pecunia redimere non voluit, occisum non negent. Nam cum illum, ut verbis utar Anglorum, aemuli ejus et inimici Dei pagani cepissent; et tamen pro reverentia illius ei potestatem se redimendi concessissent, immensam pro hoc ab eo pecuniam expetiverunt. Quam quia nullo pacto poterat habere, nisi homines suos eorum pecunia spoliaret et nonnullos forsitan invisae mendicitati subjugaret; elegit vitam perdere, quam eam tali modo custodire.

[138] *VA*, II, v: post, instinctu diaboli hominumque malorum mutatus est animus regis contra eum, eo quod ipse spoliatis hominibus suis mille libras denariorum ei pro agendis munificentiae suae gratiis dare noluit.

[139] *HN*, p. 52. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 51: Homines mei, post obitum venerabilis memoriae Lanfranci antecessoris mei, depraedati sunt et spoliati, et ego cum hucusque nihil eis unde revestiri possint contulerim, jam eos nudos spoliarem, imo spoliatos excoriarem?

Eadmer highlights similarities between Anselm and Alfege's positions: both archbishops refuse to co-operate in near identical terms when faced with apparently unreasonable demands for money.

Eadmer's report of Anselm's defence of Alfege reflects a number of ideas from Anselm's theological writing. In Eadmer's account, Anselm attributes Alfege's death to his 'love for justice', which is the same as 'love for truth'. The interchangeable nature of truth and justice mirrors themes from Anselm's theological texts, where Anselm similarly equates truth and justice.[140] In addition, Eadmer has Anselm argue that Alfege's sanctity can be justified by Alfege's apparent refusal to sin even in a small way:

> It is clear that a man, who has no hesitation in dying rather than sin against God even in a small matter, would very much rather die than anger God by committing some grave sin.[141]

This discussion resembles passages from Anselm's *Cur Deus homo*, where Anselm presents the reader with the potential sin of a man taking a single glance contrary to God's will.[142]

Further to this, Eadmer's presentation of 'authority' in this discussion is intriguing. Eadmer opens this debate by explaining that Lanfranc excelled all others in authority [*in auctoritate*], and then comments that although Lanfranc often changed things with good reason [*ratione*], he sometimes acted simply through the imposition of his authority.[143] Given Eadmer's presentation of the importance of humans using reason and Lanfranc's own criticism of Anselm's theology as lacking authorities, this account may touch on a wider theme of the importance of applying reason over blind conformity to authority.[144] Eadmer's demonstration of Anselm's use of reason to alter the view of Lanfranc and authority may

[140] See: Anselm, *De veritate*, 12.

[141] *VA*, I, xxx: Palam est quod is, qui ne leve quidem contra Deum peccatum admittat, mori non dubitat; multo maxime mori non dubitaret, priusquam aliquo gravi peccato Deum exacerbaret.

[142] Anselm, *Cur Deus homo*, I, 21.

[143] *VA*, I, xxx: erat illo tempore ullus qui aut Lanfranco in auctoritate vel multiplici rerum scientia… Quapropter cum plures de illis magna fretus ratione, tum quasdam mutavit sola auctoritatis suae deliberatione.

[144] See: Anselm, *Monologion*, Prologue. Anselm, *Ep.* 72.

relate to the individual human's abilities and the limited nature of human authority, if this is used without the application of reason.

This inclusion of the defence of Alfege has been analysed as forming part of Eadmer's wider support for Canterbury saints.[145] However, Eadmer does not appear to have had any particular interest in the cult of Alfege; the primary focus surrounds Saint Dunstan.[146] Given the appearance of this lengthy episode, it seems likely that this debate is more accurately depicted as primarily concerned with Anselm, and probably beyond proving Anselm's abilities with rhetoric and debate. Eadmer's defence of Alfege's sanctity may have been intended to create a parallel argument for Anselm's own sanctity. In the *Vita Anselmi*, the refusal of Alfege to despoil his men or to sin against God even in a small way is accepted by the character of Lanfranc as a valid argument for Alfege's sanctity.[147] Given Anselm's apparently duplicate actions, which are described in near identical terms, this scene may act as a justification of Anselm's own actions as being morally correct and as having precedent in the form of a saint. It is possible that this case was also intended as a defence for Anselm's own sanctity on parallel grounds. The role of Lanfranc in this account as being at first sceptical, but ultimately persuaded to the point that he apparently orders the writing of a history appears integral to the overall account. Anselm was facing fierce criticism at Canterbury and his case for sanctity was disputed, forming still further parallels with Alfege's own recently contested sanctity.[148] This episode may have been intended to remind a sceptical Canterbury audience that Archbishop Lanfranc had accepted Alfege's unorthodox case for sanctity, and on similar grounds that Eadmer was claiming for Anselm.

The *Vita Anselmi* and Eadmer's authorial method

[145] See: J. Rubenstein, 'Liturgy against History: The Competing visions of Lanfranc and Eadmer of Canterbury, *Speculum* 74, 2 (1999), pp. 279-309.

[146] Dunstan is a central figure in the opening of the *Historia*, whereas Alfege gets only a brief mention, and Dunstan is the saint who appears both to Lanfranc and to Anselm. Further to this, Eadmer chose to rework Osbern's *Vita Dunstani* but not Osbern's *Vita Alfege*.

[147] *VA*, I, xxx.

[148] This is especially significant when Eadmer's numerous mentions of Anselm's 'detractors' are taken into account. *VA*, *Miracula*, p. 170: detrahunt. Eadmer, *Historia,* p. 220**:** detractors.

This chapter has demonstrated that Eadmer faithfully incorporated a great deal of Anselm's teaching on the love of God, love of neighbour, discipline and moderation into the *Vita Anselmi*. As Eadmer emphasises that Anselm's life mirrored his teachings, this appearance of Anselmian themes in the *Vita Anselmi* may be expected.[149] However, the frequent use of Anselmian ideas and the consistency of these themes across the text creates a coherent vision of human nature and of Anselm's own behaviours and teachings. These behaviours and teachings do not appear to develop in the text, despite Eadmer apparently recording decades of Anselm's life. There are multiple areas in the *Vita Anselmi* which suggest that Eadmer deliberately crafted the text to fit one version of Anselm's teachings and systematically excluded details and themes which might have caused the narrative to deviate from this set path. This final section will explore two examples in the *Vita Anselmi* where Anselm's theory and practise appear to be in conflict. The first occurs early in the text where Eadmer outlines Anselm's policy when receiving new monks. Eadmer later gives an example where this policy is clearly not followed. Evidence from Anselm's letter collection demonstrates that the policy in question, if applied, is likely to have dated from far later in Anselm's career. Eadmer may have consciously backdated this policy, removing the likely circumstances of its instigation. The second example regards Anselm's teachings on obedience, and shows a contradiction between Eadmer's report in the *Vita Anselmi* and the evidence which survives in Anselm's letter collection.

Early in the *Vita Anselmi*, Eadmer describes Anselm's involvement in the conversion of a knight called Cadulus to the monastic life. Eadmer takes the opportunity to outline Anselm's policy on recruiting new monks. In this chapter, Eadmer explains that after an encounter with the Devil, Cadulus listens to Anselm's conversation and then decides to become a monk, joining the monastery at Marmoutier.[150] The explanation for this choice is given:

> It was Anselm's custom, notwithstanding any hope of advantage, never to persuade anyone who wished to renounce the world, to do so at his own monastery rather than elsewhere. And the consideration which led him to act thus was as follows: if anyone

[149] *VA*, I, xxi.

[150] *VA*, I, xxv.

> entered the monastery except as a result of his own deliberation, and then – as might happen – found it irksome and began to disparage it, he might attribute his own scandalised and impatient grumbling to Anselm's persuasion, and so make serious divisions between him and the others.[151]

This discussion appears to fit with some of Anselm's most prominent teaching on the monastic life, such as the letter to Lanzo, where Anselm appears very concerned with issues of dissatisfaction and regret in the minds of new recruits.[152]

However, despite Eadmer's claim that Anselm never personally persuaded monks to take up the monastic life at Bec, there is an example later on in the *Vita Anselmi* where this policy appears to have been disregarded. The second case in the text where an individual joins the monastic life after conversing with Anselm concerns Boso. Eadmer's full account of Boso's conversion is given as follows:

> At this period, a certain clerk – a young man called Boso – came to Bec seeking an interview with the abbot, for he had a very acute mind, and he was perplexed by many intricate problems which no-one whom he had been able to meet had unravelled to his satisfaction. He talked therefore to Anselm and laid bare the perplexities of his heart; and he received from him all the answers he required without leaving a shadow of uncertainty. As a result he was moved to admiration and captivated by a profound love for Anselm; and as he came to enjoy the intimacy of his conversation, he was led on to despise the world, and in a short time became a monk of Bec.[153]

---

[151] *VA*, I, xxv: Hunc etenim usum Anselmus habebat, ut nunquam alicujus commodi causa suaderet alicui saeculo renuntiare volenti, quatenus in suo monasterio potius quam in alieno id faceret. Quod nimirum eo intuitu, ea consideratione faciebat, ne ullus postmodum loco quem ex propria deliberatione non intraverat, aliqua ut fit pulsatus molestia detraheret, et scandali sui ac impatientiae murmur persuasioni illius imputaret, itaque se aliis et alios sibi ad multa divisus graves efficeret.

[152] Anselm, *Ep.* 37. Also, *VA*, I, xx.

[153] *VA*, I, xxxiv: Inter haec quidam clericus aetate juvenis, Boso nomine, Beccum venit, abbatis colloquium expetens. Erat enim idem acer ingenio, et quibusdam perplexis quaestionibus involverat animum, nec reperire quemquam poterat qui eas sibi ad votum evolveret. Loquens igitur cum Anselmo, ac nodos ei sui cordis depromens, omnia quae desiderabat ab eo sine scrupulo deceptionis accepit. Miratus ergo hominem est, et

The cases of Cadulus and Boso are almost identical: both men seek an interview with Abbot Anselm, hear Anselm's conversation and then, as a direct consequence of their contact with Anselm, both decide to become monks. There are even similar obstacles presented by the Devil in these conversions.[154] Anselm's central role in Boso's decision is also recounted in the *Vita Bosonis*, a later text written by a Bec author. This may suggest that Anselm's involvement is probably historically accurate.[155] The contradiction between Eadmer's earlier statement of Anselm's policy and this later example may represent an authorial error where Eadmer inadvertently failed to maintain the consistency of his themes.

Evidence from Anselm's letter collection suggests that this policy was never actually enforced at Bec. Eadmer presents Cadulus' conversion as occurring during one of Anselm's last years as prior of Bec, and the following chapter describes Anselm's promotion to abbot in 1078.[156] Despite Eadmer's statement of Anselm's policy when converting new monks, Anselm's letter collection shows that whilst serving as both prior and abbot of Bec, Anselm was actively encouraging others to become monks, and particularly to join Bec: see, Letters 15, 36, 56, 115, 117 and 120.[157] These letters span a period between 1073 and 1086, with three dating to c.1086, suggesting that Eadmer's account is incorrect.[158] In letters dating up to 1092, Anselm also writes to a number of people urging them to take up the monastic life, without a specific invitation to join Bec.[159]

It is notable that after becoming archbishop, Anselm's letters no longer contain these calls for others to become monks; Anselm's later letters are predominantly concerned with

---

nimio illius amore devinctus. Dehinc ergo cum ejus allocutione familiarite potiretur, illectus ad contemptum saeculi emenso brevi spatio, Becci monachus factus est.

[154] Compare with: *VA*, I, xxv, xxxiv.

[155] 'Vita Bosonis' in Migne, *PL*, vol. 150, 723-32, at 723-726.

[156] *VA*, I, xxvi.

[157] Letters where Anselm encourages others to become monks at Bec: Anselm, *Epp*. 15, 36, 56, 115, 117 and 120.

[158] Dating for the letters is given by Fröhlich as follows: *Epp*. 15 (before March 1073), 36 (1073), 56 (c.1070-1078), 115 (1086), 117 (1086) and 120 (1086). *The Letters of Saint Anselm of Canterbury*, trans. Fröhlich, vol. 1, pp. 103, 132, 168, 276, 281, 287.

[159] Letters where Anselm merely urges others to become monks, and does not specific where: Anselm, *Epp.* 44, 81, 95, 112, 121, 133.

business.[160] This change is probably related to Anselm's election to archbishop in 1093; the Bec monks strongly resisted the appointment, reminding Anselm of his personal duty towards them. Anselm wrote a number of lengthy letters attempting to pacify the unhappy community and these letters reveal the degree of his personal role in recruiting his monks.[161] Evidence of this is contained within Letter 156. In this letter, written Prior Baldric and the monks of Bec, Anselm asked:

> Do not place your hope in man but in God, because if I was of any use to you it was not my own doing but his. Many of you, nearly all, came to Bec because of me [*propter me*], but nobody became a monk because of me or for any hope of a reward from me.[162]

This excerpt indicates that Anselm had been a primary factor in many of his monks' decisions to join Bec, and that Anselm was fully aware of his role. Anselm's letters replying to the Bec monks addressed a number of accusations made against Anselm personally: charges of ambition, of having failed to resist his election, of abandonment and of Anselm's unsuitability for the role of archbishop.[163] In Letter 156, it is clear that some of these contentions, if not all, originated from within the Bec community. Anselm's concerns in his letters revolved around his loss of the love of the brothers and of the likely sin incurred by those 'instigators' of this 'false suspicion'.[164] Following his release from the duty of abbot, Anselm wrote a number of letters to colleagues over the following months, asking them to offer the monks of Bec their encouragement, which may suggest that Anselm was concerned about the brothers'

[160] See comment in Southern, *Biographer,* p. 76.

[161] Anselm writes three letters to the Bec monks. See: Anselm, *Epp.* 148, 151, 156.

[162] Anselm, *Ep.* 156: Non sit in homine spes vestra sed in deo; quia si quid vobis profui, non a me fuit sed ab eo. Multi propter me, et fere omnes Beccum venistis; sed nullus propter me monachus factus est nec propter spem retributionis meae.

[163] See particularly Anselm, *Ep.* 156.

[164] Anselm, *Ep.* 156: De me vos precor ne minus me diligatis, si deus facit de me voluntatem suam. Also: Certus autem sum quia quidquid nocuit haec falsa suscipio alicui animae vel nocebit, peccatum hoc super se suscipient, si plures sunt auctores eius; et sive unus sive plures sint, maxime super eum erit qui maxime eius auctor est.

welfare.[165] Given the prominence of this dispute and the absence of calls to join the monastic life in Anselm's letters as archbishop, this case may be the point where Anselm adopted this policy of non-recruitment.

The 1093 Bec case contains all the potential issues which Eadmer shows Anselm highlighting in the c.1078 scene in the *Vita Anselmi*: Anselm's promotion caused a division in the community, alluded to in a number of letters. The backlash Anselm faced may resemble the 'scandalised and impatient grumbling' referenced in Eadmer's explanation of why Anselm did not recruit monks to join his own monastery.[166] Eadmer completely omits any mention of the problems with the monks of Bec from the *Vita Anselmi*. The later report of Anselm's reticence to convert Muslims at Rome in 1098 may further display Anselm's reservations about taking a personal role in recruiting, after having directly experienced the negative consequences.[167]

This case study is probably an example of Eadmer attributing a conviction which Anselm developed through experience and held in his maturity to Anselm in his youth. This reassessment of Anselm's past maintains one overarching vision of the saint and effectively removes the scandal from Anselm's life. Given Eadmer's access to Anselm's letter collection, personal knowledge of the nature of Boso's conversion and likely awareness of the troubles Anselm encountered when leaving Bec, it may be assumed that Eadmer must have been aware of the inaccuracy in his own text. This example, therefore, may give insight into Eadmer's narratorial strategy and highlight his focus on showcasing and promoting Anselm's perfected teaching rather than simply recounting stories from Anselm's life.

A second example where Eadmer's account appears to conflict with historic events appears in Eadmer's presentation of Anselm's obedience. In this second case, Eadmer does not directly contradict himself, but instead omits information which would present a reader with a more nuanced picture. The topic of obedience as presented in the *Vita Anselmi* draws on Anselm's own discussion in his letters. In summary, monks are expected to be obedient to

[165] See: Anselm, *Epp.* 158, 159, 163. He also writes three letters of encouragment to the monks themselves in this period, Anselm, *Epp.* 164, 165, 166.

[166] *VA*, I, xxv: et scandali sui ac impatientiae murmur persuasioni illius imputaret.

[167] *VA*, II, xxxiii.

superiors such as abbots and other spiritual leaders. This is expressed in the *Vita Anselmi*, where Anselm is shown to conform to his own teaching on the subject. When exploring the topic, Eadmer emphasises that Anselm only became abbot because he was ordered to by Archbishop Mauritius of Rouen. Eadmer describes Anselm's particular deference to Lanfranc's guidance, explaining:

> By this time Anselm's devotion to Lanfranc was so great, that if while they were going to Rouen through the great wood which lies above Bec Lanfranc had said to him 'Stay in this wood and see that you never come out so long as you live', without a doubt, as he used to say, he would have obeyed the command.[168]

This depiction of Anselm's practise of monastic obedience bears comparison with Anselm's writing on obedience in his letters, but may be slightly nuanced.

Anselm's writing on a human's obedience to other humans often emphasises the obedience owed to God over man. This appears as a limit on inter-personal obedience, which Eadmer chooses not to duplicate in the *Vita Anselmi*. Numerous examples can be found in Letter 37, where Anselm urges a monk to remain at his monastery 'unless it is so bad that he is unwillingly forced to do evil there'. Anselm repeats this limitation when ordering obedience to the customs of a monastery, writing that a monk should not pass judgement on the customs of a monastery 'if they are not contrary to God's commands'. A monk should obey these customs 'provided they are not contrary to God's commands'.[169] The pre-eminence of obedience to God over obedience to man accords with other discussions of obedience in Anselm's letters, where in one letter Anselm advises Prior Baldric of Bec that 'true obedience indeed is either to God or to the church of God and, after God, above all to superiors'. [170] Anselm's view of inter-personal obedience, as expressed in his letters, was one which allowed

---

[168] *VA*, I, vi: Tanta autem vis devotionis pectus Anselmi tunc possidebat, tantumque veri consilii Lanfranco inesse credebat, ut cum Rothomagum petentes, per magnam quae super Beccum est silvam pergerent, si Lanfrancus ei diceret, in hac silva mane, et ne dum vixeris hinc exeas cave, procul dubio ut fatebatur imperata servaret.

[169] Anselm, *Ep.* 37: nisi tale fuerit ut ibi malum invitus facere cogatur… si contra divina praecepta non sunt… et nisi monasterii sui instituta, quae divinis non prohibentur mandatis.

[170] Anselm, *Ep.* 156: Vera autem oboedientia aut est deo aut ecclesiae dei, et post deum maxime praelatis. See same sentiment expressed also: Anselm, *Ep.* 165: Oboedite praepositis vestris et subicite vos eis.

for disobedience to other humans, even superiors, if for the sake of keeping obedience to God. The practical application of this form of obedience relies almost entirely upon a human's ability to judge where monastic customs or a superior's orders would be in conflict with God's will.

There is one prominent case where Anselm ignored the guidance of his superiors, and this regards the editing of the *Monologion*.[171] After composing this text, Anselm wrote to Lanfranc asking for his guidance and for a suggestion for the title, in this letter Anselm offered to defer to Lanfranc's 'authority' on the matter of the text's suitability.[172] Lanfranc is believed to have replied criticising Anselm's lack of explicit authorities and declined to give the work a title.[173] Despite his letter, Anselm appears to have completely dismissed Lanfranc's advice. The only alteration Anselm seems to have made to the text is to state in the *Prologue* that the work agreed with Augustine, and that those who disagree ought to reread Augustine's *De trinitate*.[174] The exchange between Lanfranc and Anselm is dated to c.1077.[175] At this point, Lanfranc was archbishop of Canterbury and had previously served as abbot of Caen. In addition, Lanfranc was a recognised authority in grammar and had even taught Anselm himself.[176] By comparison, Anselm was prior of Bec and the *Monologion* was his first major work. Although scholars have seen this exchange as occurring almost between equals and friends, at this point Anselm was a relative newcomer to philosophy who was approaching a foremost figure.[177] Although Lanfranc was giving Anselm advice and not a command, there

[171] For a discussion of Eadmer's narration of the production of the *Proslogion* and its possible relation to problems at Bec: G. E. M. Gasper, 'Envy, Jealoisy and the Boundaries of Orthodoxy: Anselm, Eadmer and the Genesis of the Proslogion', *Viator* 41 (2010), pp. 45-68.

[172] Anselm, *Ep.* 72: Hoc tamen etiam cum importunitate a vestra auctoritate non desinam exigere, quatenus de eodem opusculo, sive audito sive inaudito, quid fieri debeat vestra decernat auctoritas.

[173] See discussion: Southern, *Portrait*, pp. 119-122, 127.

[174] Anselm, *Monologion*, Prologue.

[175] See Fröhlich's comments to *Ep.* 72. *The Letters of Saint Anselm of Canterbury*, trans. Fröhlich, vol. 1, p. 198.

[176] See Southern's discussion: Southern, *Portrait*, pp. 29-32.

[177] Southern, *Portrait*, pp. 119-121. The title of this section is 'Talk among friends', which refers to Anselm's intention when approaching the topic, but it indicates the sphere within which Southern envisioned this as occurring. Anselm's decision to ignore Lanfranc's advice was presented by Southern as the 'correct' choice, justified by Anselm's place in history as the greater and more influential scholar.

was an unequal balance of experience and authority between the two men. In addition, Anselm had directly sought Lanfranc's advice, before completely dismissing it. This action can easily be fitted into a wider vision of Anselm's teachings: Anselm ought to be obedient to God before Man, and therefore if Anselm felt that publishing the *Monologion* without alterations was God's will, then Anselm was following a higher obedience.[178]

Eadmer discusses the writing of the *Monologion* in the *Vita Anselmi*, but does not mention Anselm's correspondence with Lanfranc, which if included might have directly conflicted with Eadmer's earlier depiction of Anselm as utterly reliant on Lanfranc's guidance. This example may have been included as an early gesture of Anselm's conformity to a more orthodox vision of obedience when a junior monk, Eadmer choosing to omit an episode which is widely acknowledged to have been central to Anselm's relationship with Lanfranc.[179]

Southern's identification of the *Vita Anselmi* as a work of intimate biography reflects a fairly truthful recording of Anselm's life and conversation, there is no reason to assume that Eadmer took a different authorial approach to composing this work and refrained from his customary retrospective reassessment. A lack of other surviving sources means that it is difficult to identify where Eadmer may have been reviewing the events of Anselm's life, however it is notable that Eadmer omitted many of the events which Southern identified as key moments in Anselm's life. Southern used the examples of Anselm's problems with the Bec monks in 1093 and the dispute with Lanfranc in c.1077 to explore Anselm's personal and intellectual development. Eadmer, by contrast, entirely omitted both episodes. It is significant that the Letter 156, which so clearly shows the involvement of Anselm in the personal recruitment of Bec monks and the details of the scandal, was excluded from the Canterbury letter collection, alongside associated letters (148, 151).[180] The case of Eadmer's presentation of Anselm's recruitment of monks may hint at the policy of reassessment as being applied throughout the *Vita Anselmi*.

[178] Or a variation of this. Sweeney suggests the higher authority was Augustine. Sweeney, *Anselm of Canterbury*, pp. 60-63. However, given that Anselm often refers to God's will in letters to justify decisions which others have questioned, God's will might be an alternative option.

[179] Southern, *Portait*, pp. 119-120, 127.

[180] See *The Letters of Saint Anselm of Canterbury*, trans. Fröhlich, vol. 1, p. 41.

Eadmer's use of Anselm's thought in the *Vita Anselmi* is extensive. The text is built upon a structure of Anselmian themes, which reoccur throughout the text in a consistent fashion. The insertion of Letter 37, written to guide a novice monk, and the inclusion of themes taken from this letter throughout the *Vita Anselmi* may highlight the potential use of this text as an educational tool in a monastery. Eadmer emphasised a number of central tenets to monasticism: the importance of contemplation, stability, charity and agreeableness, amongst many others. There are other subjects relevant to abbots and monastic leaders, such as discipline, recruitment and moderation. This purpose may explain Eadmer's reassessment of Anselm's early practises in light of later developments. If the *Vita Anselmi* was at least partly intended to instruct monks, then consistency and accuracy may have been of primary importance. In pursuit of this goal, Eadmer may have systematically eliminated the trials and errors of the human Anselm, in order to create a saint modelled on Anselm's conversation, theology and letters.

Chapter 3: Eadmer of Canterbury's historical writing

Eadmer of Canterbury's incorporation of Anselmian themes into the *Historia novorum in Anglia* provides a contrast to the strategy adopted in the *Vita Anselmi*. In the *Historia*, Anselmian themes appear in the organisation of the work and in the actions and reported speech of both Anselm and other characters, even Anselm's opponents. The comprehensive style of these incorporations suggests that Eadmer was actively attempting to create a history which reflected an Anselmian vision of humanity, history and the world.

Context and Background

When writing the *Preface* to the current translation of Eadmer's *Historia*, Richard Southern saw Eadmer's *Historia* as a text which reported exactly what Eadmer saw.[1] However, a close reading of the text instantly suggests otherwise. Eadmer 'records' King William Rufus using reasoning which contains Anselmian terminology and is loaded with theological meaning. This seems highly implausible. Eadmer's depiction of William Rufus as a monster of impiety with no redeeming features conflicts with Anselm's contemporary letters and other contemporary reports which produce a more balanced portrait of the king.[2] Elsewhere in the *Historia*, Eadmer reports the English bishops openly admitting that they cannot co-operate with Anselm due to their 'manifold interests of this world' rather than

[1] See Southern's *Preface* to Bosanquet's translation of the *Historia*. *HN*, pp. vii-xii.

[2] See in particular Anselm's letters collection. Anselm speaks positively of the king in Letter 147 (1092), and first refers to their quarrel in Letter 176 (Jan 1095). But by summer 1095, Anselm was praising the king's prudence and vigour in Letters 190, 191 and 192. Anselm, *Epp.* 147, 176, 190, 191, 192. William of Malmesbury's account of William Rufus in the *Gesta regum Anglorum* is generally fairly balanced, and William of Malmesbury directly states that William Rufus was an outstanding prince but was prone to pride and prodigality. William of Malmesbury uses some of Eadmer's material, but tempers Eadmer's portrait by discussing the king's magnanimity and military successes. See: William of Malmesbury, *Gesta regum Anglorum*, eds. and trans. R. A. B. Mynors, R. M. Thomson & M. Winterbottom (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), iv. 305 - iv. 314. For a full comparison of William and Eadmer's portraits, see: J. Gillingham, *William II: The Red King* (London: Allen Lane, 2015).

emphasising, for example, any of the arguments in Letter 192, which hint at more valid criticisms of Anselm's position and behaviour.[3]

Eadmer had good reason to alter events as he saw them. Anselm's time as archbishop had not been without controversy. Anselm's letters reveal that he had been criticised by contemporaries for appearing avaricious for the archbishopric, for accepting investiture from William Rufus, a schismatic king, and for the long periods spent in exile.[4] There is further evidence that, at Canterbury, Anselm was seen to have failed to safeguard the rights of the community in the primacy dispute and had even been criticised for using funds raised from selling the community's plate to pay for William Rufus' military campaigns.[5] It is clear Eadmer was aware of these criticisms. In both the miracles of Anselm, published soon after 1122, and the fifth book of the *Historia*, Eadmer directly addressed Anselm's 'detractors', which suggests that this controversy endured after Anselm's death and was a concern.[6] Eadmer may have been defensive of Anselm's achievements and legacy, and commentators such as Southern (in his later work) and Sally Vaughn have argued, to differing extents, that Eadmer distorted his account in order to present Anselm in a more positive light.[7] Eadmer's use of Anselmian themes to strengthen Anselm's position in this dispute may form part of this strategy.

---

[3] Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 82: Nos autem impediti consanguineis nostris, quos sustentamus, et multiplicibus saeculi rebus, quas amamus, fatemur. Anselm, *Ep.* 192.

[4] See: Anselm, *Epp.* 192, 310, 327, 336, 355, 365, 366.

[5] Southern, *Portrait*, p. 272.

[6] *VA, Miracula*, p. 170: detrahunt. Eadmer, *Historia,* p. 220**:** detractors.

[7] Southern's view of Eadmer's distortion evolved from his presentation of Eadmer as a mere scribe in the 1963 book: Southern, *Biographer* where Southern calls Eadmer an 'imitator' (p. 298). But perhaps the best example of Southern's earlier views on Eadmer can be seen in his *Preface* to Bosanquet's translation of the *Historia* where Southern remarks on Eadmer's limitations and presents Eadmer as a vessel guided by Anselm, merely reporting his master's words. Eadmer of Canterbury, *Historia novorum in Anglia*, trans. G. Bosanquet (London: Cresset Press, 1965), pp. vii-xii. Later, Southern's views may have changed and in the 1990 *Portrait* he portrays Eadmer working more independently (especially see: Southern, *Portrait*, pp. 414-416). Vaughn has presented Eadmer as manipulating his material in a more real way, see: S. N. Vaughn, 'Eadmer's *Historia novorum*: a reinterpretation', *ANS* 10 (1988), pp. 259-89.

Eadmer's reports in the *Vita Anselmi* that he was present for Anselm's edifying conversation at mealtimes suggest an intimate level of exposure to his ideas.[8] In addition, the inclusion of letters in the later books of the *Historia* place Eadmer as, effectively, an editor of an editor of Anselm's correspondence.[9] The strong Anselmian themes in the *Vita Anselmi* and *Historia* surely, then, reflect Eadmer's understanding of his master's work and his ability to incorporate these themes into the *Historia*. Further, the presence of Anselmian vocabulary and themes in the reported speech and behaviours of secular men such as the English king suggests that Eadmer wanted, and was able, to recreate scenes and speech in Anselmian terms.

Anselmian themes across the *Historia*

Anselmian themes are not consistent throughout the *Historia*. Books one and two contain a greater number which are expressed in a coherent fashion. As a result, the present discussion focusses principally on this section. The style of the *Historia* changes as the work enters the reign of Henry I in book three. This has been observed by a number of commentators; Eadmer's detailed scenes and dialogue give way to letters and shorter sets of dialogue.[10] The reliance on letters means that books three and four also contain less of Eadmer's original writing. Books three and four are not only shorter, therefore, but also contain less details and far less of the extended speeches which give clear Anselmian allusions. This trend continues into books five and six, which relate events after Anselm's death. In the last books, Eadmer uses a larger number of letters and almost no set speeches, meaning that very little in the way of Anselmian allusions is identifiable. Eadmer was aware of the rather different tone for the last two books, writing in the introduction to book five that he had intended to stop at the end of book four, after Anselm's death, 'the love of whom was the principal reason for writing this history'.[11] Eadmer states that in continuing to write,

[8] *VA*, II, xi.

[9] Southern, *Portrait*, p. 470.

[10] Southern, *Portrait*, pp. 413-416.

[11] Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 217**:** Translato etenim eo de hac vita cujus amor ipsius Historiae describendae causa praecipua fuit, videlicet domino et gloriosissimo Patre Anselmo Anglorum summo pontifice.

he may be guided by 'empty chance' and that his work may not contain much private conversation, which was key to understanding his writing.[12] The author then draws a line behind those things which he has written 'with certainty' and that which follows.[13]

The decline of Anselmian motifs after the break in 1100 and the relative lack after Anselm's death suggests that Anselm was vital to the formation of these themes. It is generally agreed that after Anselm discovered that Eadmer was writing the *Vita Anselmi* in 1100, Eadmer was relegated to a secondary position in Anselm's household. This event appears to be crucial to understanding the change in style between the first two books and books three and four. Southern suggested that after 1100, Eadmer may not have been present for key events which could be formed into the grand narratives such as dominate books one and two.[14] However, it is notable that Eadmer was actually not present for a number of central scenes recorded in the earlier books which are nonetheless expressed very vividly, such as the election of Anselm as archbishop.[15] In addition, Eadmer states that he was an eye-witness to some of the events after 1100 and often uses the first person plural to discuss Anselm's movements. The *Vita Anselmi* makes it clear that Eadmer was still by his master's side, as Eadmer continues to report events and miracles that happened, although there is a noticeable absence of 'private conversation'.[16]

---

[12] Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 217: si ultra procederem in scribendo, aut inania forte scripturum, aut in privato conversantem non multa, quae scribenda ratio expeteret.

[13] Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 217: Pleniter agniturum, tacita incertitudine vitae meae quae nunc quidem mihi non certior est quam tunc fuit. Verum inter haec, ex his quae scripseram certo comperiens me multorum voluntati ac dilectioni morem gessisse.

[14] Southern, *Portrait*, pp. 413-416.

[15] Eadmer mentioned that two monks were with Anselm at his consecration and names them as Baldwin and Eustace. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 34: Balduinum videlicet et Eustachium.

[16] See examples of Eadmer indicating he was travelling with Anselm in Eadmer, *Historia*, pp. 118-119, 137, 149, 164, 181-2. At the case of Matilda: Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 125: En ordinem gestae rei, teste conscientiae meae veritate; sicut eam praesens audivi et vidi in nullam partem declinando descripsi. It is noticeable that Eadmer does continue to report the words of Anselm, but the *Historia* starts to read far more like a historical account of events. Although there are not the grand scenes of books one and two, books three and four are still very detailed. In a way, they read more like books five and six which follow the life of Eadmer. It is worth noting that if Anselm had wished to exclude Eadmer entirely from the archbishop's life, Eadmer might have been used as a messenger or just sent home to Canterbury.

This lack of a strong correlation between Eadmer being an eye-witness to recorded events and the incorporation of strong Anselmian themes into these events may further suggest that Eadmer was not just recording what he saw. Instead, the 1100 break may represent a point where Anselm became reluctant to discuss his understanding of events with Eadmer and no longer guided Eadmer's understanding of the conflicts.[17] The coherent nature of the world of the early books operates with the same polarity and reasoning which exists in Anselm's theological texts, highly influenced by Augustinian theology.

History in the defence of Anselm: old and new history in the *Historia*

The narrative in the *Historia* does not begin with Anselm. Eadmer opens his history of England in the middle of the tenth century, during the reign of Anglo-Saxon King Edgar I (943-975) who is described ruling England with the aid of Archbishop Dunstan of Canterbury.[18] The *Historia* then briefly outlines Dunstan's activities in the time of King Edward, before covering Dunstan's death in the reign of King Ethelred. After Dunstan's death, Eadmer gives an account of the Viking invasions of King Ethelred's reign, including a description of the career of Archbishop Alfege, before moving to the events at the end of Edward the Confessor's reign.[19] Anselm is mentioned for the first time during the reign of King William I, which comes after Eadmer's account of the Norman Conquest.[20] Whatever the *Historia'*s purpose, it hardly provides a comprehensive history of England even from Eadmer's starting point in the mid-tenth century. Between the time of King Edgar and Archbishop Dunstan in the mid-tenth century and the 1066 invasion of England, there were ten English kings and ten archbishops of Canterbury. The text of the *Historia* mentions just five of these ten kings and only three of the ten archbishops, moving between the included figures often with no real indication of

[17] Southern, *Portrait*, pp. 413-416.

[18] Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 3.

[19] Eadmer, *Historia,* pp. 3-9.

[20] Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 23.

how much time is omitted.[21] This creates a cursory account of later Anglo-Saxon history where Eadmer focusses on a handful of key characters and catastrophes.

Eadmer structures the opening of his work around the relationships between kings and their key churchmen, which has been compared to Bede.[22] However, the highly thematic style of this section with specific focusses on key characters, prophecy and disasters differentiates Eadmer's history of England from other models. Another principal theme of Eadmer's opening is the overall significance of Canterbury ecclesiastics and the historic role of these men as key advisors to the king. The opening to the text establishes a coherent model of the correct style of relationship which should exist between kings and their archbishop-advisors. Poor relationships are often attributed to the refusal of counsel by bad kings, the consequences of these failures depicted as inevitably disastrous for the realm.

The opening to the *Historia* has not been of great interest to modern historians. Eadmer's work has principally been studied as a record of contemporary history and as a record of Anselm's career as archbishop. It is clear, nonetheless, that Eadmer planned the opening with care and saw it as relevant to his work as a whole. In the *Preface*, he explains:

> We should, we think, begin by going a little further back and tracing in brief outline what was, so to speak, the actual planting of the seed from which grew the developments which we are to record.[23]

---

[21] History records ten kings: Edgar, Edward, Ethelred, Sweyn, (Ethelred), Edmund Ironside, Cnut, Harold Harefoot, Harthacnut, Edward the Confessor and Harold. Eadmer mentions Edgar, Edward, Ethelred, Edward the Confessor and Harold. There were ten archbishops: Dunstan, Ethelgar, Sigeric, Elfric, Alfege, Lyfing, Ethelnoth, Eadsige, Robert of Jumieges, Stigand. Eadmer mentions Dunstan, Alfege and Eadsige, and the latter only very briefly. Later in the text, he mentions Stigand, to explain why the archbishop did not crown William I, but Stigand is not mentioned in the historical account. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 9. At one point, Eadmer does indicate that he is passing over some of these figures, so when he introduces Alfege, Eadmer mentions that he is fourth in succession from Dunstan, but this is the sole indication of the missing characters. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 4.

[22] Vaughn, 'Eadmer's *Historia novorum*: a reinterpretation', pp. 263-8. Vaugn's analysis focusses on the relationship between Dunstan and Edgar.

[23] *HN*, p. 2. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 2: Caeterum narrandi ordinem aggredientes, paulo altius ordiendum putamus; et ab ipsa, ut ita dixerim, radicis propagine de qua eorum quae dicenda sunt germen excrevit, brevi relatu progrediendum.

This has been taken to refer to the absence of episcopal investiture in Anglo-Saxon practise, but Eadmer does not actually emphasis this theme in the opening and instead gives an account of royal-ecclesiastical relations, which varied over this period.

The opening to the *Historia* is unusual, especially with respect to the pattern of events that seem to emerge from Eadmer's account. Even within the overall structure of following the relationships between kings and their archbishops, Eadmer's presentation of the history of England seems cyclical, with near-contemporary events patterned on earlier events, or vice versa. The opening can be easily divided into three periods of history: 1) Dunstan's relationships with Edgar and Ethelred, Dunstan's prophecy and the following Viking invasion, 2) Edward the Confessor's relationship with Harold, Edward's pre-sentiment and the following Norman invasion and 3) Lanfranc's relationship with William I and the disasters of William Rufus' reign. All three cycles have similar events and an identical conception of the ideal regal-ecclesiastic relationships. This is not to say that Eadmer was suggesting that history was repeating itself exactly, as there are clear differences between the accounts, but there is, nonetheless, a clear patterning in the historic and contemporary events described in the opening of the *Historia*.

This trend appears particularly clear with a comparison between the account of Archbishop Dunstan's times and contemporary events. Eadmer describes that Archbishop Lanfranc initially served King William I, who is shown to be receptive to counsel. After William I's death, his son William Rufus becomes king. Eadmer explains:

> William, when he was intent on seizing the prize of the kingdom before his brother Robert, found Lanfranc, without whose support he could not possible attain the throne, not altogether favourable to the fulfilment if this desire.[24]

Eadmer relates that William Rufus swore Lanfranc an oath, promising to rule well. But after William Rufus' coronation, this king breaks his promise:

[24] *HN,* p. 26. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 25: successit ei in regnum Willhelmus filius ejus, qui cum regni fastigia fratri suo Roberto praeripere gestiret; et Lanfrancum, sine cujus assensu in regnum ascisci nullatenus poterat, sibi in hoc ad expletionem desiderii sui non omnino consentaneum inveniret.

> But when he was once firmly established on the throne he turned his back on his promise and gave himself up to courses the very opposite of all this. When on that account he was mildly reproved by Lanfranc and was confronted with his promise and his breach of faith…[25]

Lanfranc then dies and Eadmer continues:

> But when Lanfranc was taken from this life, at once on his death how grievous a calamity overtook the Churches of England: this, while omitting much, it is my purpose briefly to describe. [26]

This account of Lanfranc's relationships with his kings may have provided the template for Eadmer's portrayal of the historic Dunstan's relationships with King Edgar and his sons, the brothers Edward and Ethelred.[27] Lanfranc's successful relationship with King William I is followed by a difficult relationship with that king's son, William Rufus. Eadmer also mentions the elder, dispossessed son, Duke Robert and the resulting disaster after Lanfranc's death.

Earlier in the *Historia*, Eadmer had explained that Archbishop Dunstan enjoyed peace and co-operation with King Edgar. After Edgar's death, Dunstan rules briefly alongside Edgar's son, King Edward, but this king is murdered by his own brother, Ethelred, who then becomes king. Dunstan rebukes Ethelred sharply for his actions, prophesying that disaster will fall on England as a consequence. Eadmer describes the consequent disaster occurring after Dunstan's death.[28] This is hardly a full account of Dunstan's career. In Eadmer's *Vita Dunstani*,

---

[25] *HN*, p. 26. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 25: Sed cum posthac in regno fuisset confirmatus, postposita pollicitatione sua, in contraria dilapsus est. Super quo cum a Lanfranco modeste redargueretur, et ei sponsio fidei non servatae opponeretur.

[26] *HN*, p. 27. Eadmer, *Historia*, pp. 25-26: Qui cum de hac vita translatus fuisset, quam gravis calamitas ex obitu illius Ecclesias Angliae devastaverit.

[27] There may be a further allusion here to the story of Cain and Abel, as one bad brother slays the good brother, or even to the story of Romulus and Remus. Augustine argued that the fratricide of Cain and Abel was repeated in the founding of Rome and Romulus' killing of Remus. Augustine, Augustine of Hippo, *De civitate Dei,* Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina; 47; 48, eds. B. Dombart & A. Kalb (Turnhout: Brepols, 1955), Book XIV, 5.

[28] Eadmer, *Historia*, pp. 4-5.

Eadmer describes Dunstan's relationships with Kings Athelstan, Edmund, Eadred and Eadwig, who reigned before Edgar became king, but these kings are not mentioned in the *Historia*.[29]

The first lines of the *Historia* contain an outline of the relationship that existed between Archbishop Dunstan and King Edgar, which follows the same pattern of King William I's with Lanfranc. Eadmer opens the work of the *Historia* as follows:

> In the reign of that most glorious King, Edgar, while he governed diligently the whole realm of England with righteous laws, Dunstan, Prelate of Canterbury, a man of unblemished goodness, ordered the whole of Britain by the administration of the law Christian. Under his influence and counsel King Edgar shewed himself a devoted servant of God; and, when foreign invaders surged in on every side, with indomitable courage he fought them, conquered them and kept them at bay. England enjoyed peace and happiness…[30]

From the first instance, the *Historia* sets up a particular vision of how kings and archbishops ought to work together. King Edgar is immediately established as an ideal king: a 'gloriosissimus rex'. The reasons for his success are made clear: Edgar is willing to accept counsel from Archbishop Dunstan. This style of partnership later appears in the account of the co-operation between William I and Lanfranc, if in an imperfect form. Eadmer describes the relationship between Lanfranc and William: 'Lanfranc had the ear of King William, not merely as one of his advisors but rather as his principal advisor…'.[31] When Anselm is introduced, he works with Lanfranc in a similar manner:

> These two men, Anselm and Lanfranc, both equipped with wisdom divine and human alike, were ever held by the King in high esteem and in all decisions which he had to

[29] *VD*, pp. 70, 79, 90, 92.

[30] *HN*, p. 3. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 3: Regnante in Anglia gloriosissimo rege Edgaro, et totum regnum sanctis legibus strenue gubernante, Dunstanus Cantuariorum antistes, vir totus ex virtutibus factus, Christianae legis moderamine totam Britanniam disponebat. Hujus gravi operatione atque consilio rex idem et Deo devotus exstitit, et undique irruentium barbarorum impetus invicta virtute debellavit, evicit, compressit. Pacem itaque diesque felices Anglia circumquaque obtinuit.

[31] *HN*, p. 12. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 12: Is inter alios, imo prae aliis, erat memorato regi Willhelmo acceptus.

make, so far as the matter related to their province, the King listened to them more readily than to his other counsellors.[32]

Lanfranc (and Anselm's) efforts at advising the king have effect on King William I, and his reign is presented as a relative success. Not only do the account of historic events mirror contemporary ones, but both historic and contemporary characters have similar relationships.

Further to this, there are a number of parallels with minor happenings in the text. Eadmer directly links Lanfranc's guidance to William I's restoration of Canterbury's lands and the establishment of monasteries in England.[33] This is interesting, because Eadmer also mentions that monasteries had 'in the time of King Edgar sprung up as new foundations'.[34] During the disaster that follows Dunstan's death, Ethelred is reported to have been 'grinding down the whole kingdom with crushing exactions' in his quest for money.[35] After Lanfranc's death, William Rufus' first actions are to place burdens upon the church.[36] Eadmer clearly knew a great deal about Dunstan's career, and the swift outline of Dunstan's times at the start of the *Historia* must have been chosen carefully and for good reason.

These themes of royal-ecclesiastical relationships, prophecy and disaster continue into the reign of Edward the Confessor. Eadmer gives an account of the end of this king's reign, when there was not an appropriate archbishop of Canterbury to offer guidance to his secular lord, as Archbishop Stigand was a simoniac and had been deposed multiple times by the papacy.[37] Eadmer's personal view of Stigand is made clear later in the text, where he

[32] *HN*, pp. 24-5. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 23: Hunc itaque et Lanfrancum videlicet viros divina simul et humana prudentia fultos, prae se magni semper habebat, et eos in omnibus quae sibi, quantum officii eorum referebat, agenda erant, dulciori prae caeteris studio audiebat.

[33] Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 12.

[34] *HN*, p. 5. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 5: monasteria quoque servorum et ancillarum Dei, quae usque in quadraginta octo numero, tempore regis Edgari per Patrem Dunstanum… nova surrexerant.

[35] *HN*, p. 4. Eadmer, *Historia,* p. 4: et gravi exactione totum regnum opprimente.

[36] Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 26.

[37] Eadmer's decision to exclude Stigand from this narrative probably reflects the need to portray Canterbury in a positive light by not lingering on the misdeeds of a recent controversial archbishop.

states Stigand had committed 'many wicked and horrible crimes'.[38] In this case, the partnered lord and advisor appear as Harold (as secular) and Edward the Confessor (as advisor). This appearance of Edward the Confessor in the position usually filled by an ecclesiastical advisor may be less surprising considering that there was a growing cult for Edward's sanctity in the early twelfth century, a cult which had been growing since 1066.[39]

This case of Harold and Edward the Confessor contains the same basic narrative of events and the same themes of counsel, prophecy and disaster. Eadmer reports that Harold asked Edward the Confessor's permission to go to Normandy to free Harold's brother and nephew, who were being held there as hostages. Edward the Confessor responds as follows:

> 'I will have no part in this but not to give the impression of wishing to hinder you, I give you leave to go where you will and to see what you can do. But I have a presentiment that you will only succeed in bringing misfortune upon the whole kingdom…' Harold, trusting his own judgement rather than the king's embarked on board ship…[40]

The trip goes badly and Harold reports back to his king: 'The king exclaimed: 'Did not I tell you that I knew William and that your going might bring untold calamity upon this kingdom?' Shortly after this Edward died…'[41] Eadmer's account of this 'presentiment' may have been at least partly inspired by the contemporary *Vita Aedwardi Regis*, where a delirious Edward is recorded as making the Prophecy of the Green Tree on his deathbed.[42] In this earlier text,

---

[38] *HN*, p. 9. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 9: quia multa mala et horrenda crimina praedicabantur de Stigando.

[39] After 1066, a cult of Edward as a saint developed with increasing intensity in the early twelfth century. Given Eadmer's particular interest in saints and hagiography in general, it may be assumed that he was aware of this cult and possibly of the work. The work is anonymous, but may have been written by Goscelin or Folcard, monks of St. Bertain Abbey. On the development of Edward's cult and the *Vita* in general, see F. Barlow, *Edward the Confessor* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1997), pp. 256-285.

[40] *HN*, p. 6. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 6: Hoc, inquit, non fiet per me; verumtamen ne videar te velle impedire, permitto ut eas quo vis, ac experiare quid possis. Praesentio tamen te in nihil aliud tendere, nisi in detrimentum totius Anglici regni et opprobrium tui… itaque Haraldus navem suo quam regis consilio credens…

[41] *HN*, p. 8. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 8: Nonne dixi tibi, ait, me Willhelmum nosse, et in illo itinere tuo plurima mala huic regno contingere posse? In brevi post haec obiit Edwardus.

[42] Anon, *Vita Edwardi Regis qui apud Westmonasterium requiescit*, ed. and trans. F. Barlow (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, 1962), Book II, xx. Later contemporaries took this prophecy to refer to the Saxon and

Edward is described as predicting that God would punish England until a 'parent stem' and a 'Green Tree' were unified.[43] It is extremely likely that Eadmer was familiar with this text; a revised edition of the c.1065 text was likely made at Christ Church, Canterbury at 1100.[44] Eadmer may have deemed this particular episode as incompatible with his overall narrative, as the anonymous author of the *Vita Aedwardi* blames the sins of the English people and priests for the coming disasters and there is no theme of counsel or of regal-ecclesiastic relationships.[45] Eadmer's version of the prediction instead parallels Dunstan's earlier prophecy, where the advisor prophesises future disaster if his counsel is ignored. In both cases the advisor then dies, whereupon England suffers invasion as the prophecy is fulfilled. There are some further oddities in the cycle of Edward the Confessor and Harold which may be related to contemporary events, for example, Canterbury is reported to have been burnt following the disasters of both Edward and Dunstan's prophecies.[46] Kings Harold and William Rufus share certain qualities, such as both being perjurers: Harold breaks his oath to William I and William Rufus to Lanfranc.[47] In addition, Eadmer's explicit identification of God as directly having intervened in human history to end the lives of both Harold and William Rufus represent rare moments where Eadmer attributes human death to God's hand.[48]

Norman dynasties, with William of Malmesbury referring it to the match of Henry's son William to the daughter of Fulk of Anjou. Discussed in: M. Evans, *The death of kings: Royal deaths in medieval England* (London-New York: Hambledon and London, 2003), p. 102.

[43] Anon, *Vita Edwardi Regis*, ed. and trans. Barlow, II, xx.

[44] Barlow, *Edward the Confessor*, pp. 257-8.

[45] Southern argued that Eadmer was not convinced by Edward the Confessor's sanctity, but the Edward-Harold pairing may suggest otherwise. Southern, *Biographer*, p. 311.

[46] Eadmer, *Historia*, pp. 4, 12.

[47] Eadmer, *Historia*, pp. 8, 26.

[48] Eadmer, *Historia*, pp. 9, 117. There is a further reason to believe that Eadmer may have seen a similarity between the deaths of Harold and William Rufus. At the kings' deaths, in both cases Eadmer uses an identical verb to indicate their deaths, the verb *caedo*. Eadmer even makes a point of emphasising that William Rufus may have fell upon the arrow. It is notable that this use mirrors Anselm's use of *cado* to refer to the fall of bad angels in *De casu diaboli*. In addition, some scholars have argued that Eadmer may have seen the Bayeux Tapestry, or that the Tapestry and the Eadmer were drawing on similar information, as the Tapestry follows the same narrative as Eadmer gives in the *Historia*. These similarities are discussed in: N. P. Brooks., 'The Authority and Interpretation of the Bayeux Tapestry', *ANS* 1 (1978), pp. 1-34. In addition, current scholarship

This account of English history gives insight into Eadmer's view of history. Eadmer gives plenty of indication of how he viewed the *Historia.* One of the clearest statements as to his reason for writing appears in the *Preface* to the *Vita Anselmi*:

> Since we have seen many strange changes in England in our days and developments which were quite unknown in former days, I committed to writing a brief record of some of these things, lest the knowledge of them should be entirely lost to future generations.[49]

Eadmer makes it clear here that his interest in contemporary history relates to his perception of it as strange and irregular. There is also a parallel statement in the *Preface* to the *Historia*, where Eadmer writes:

> The principal intention of this work is to describe the causes of the discord which arose between Anselm and the kings of England, which led to his long exiles from the kingdom. The cause of these exiles is the novelty [*nova res*] of our time.[50]

This new thing is sometimes assumed to be referring to William I's imposition of regalian rights, but Southern in his 1963 work pointed to a different conclusion, suggesting that the 'nova res' refers to the resistance of the archbishop of Canterbury to royal authority over the church.[51] This may be convincing, as Eadmer does not condemn Lanfranc for working alongside William I, and Anselm does not make an argument based on precedent throughout

---

suggests that the Tapestry was produced in Canterbury, at St. Augustine's. See: C. Hart, 'The Bayeux Tapestry and schools of illumination at Canterbury', *ANS* 22 (1999), p. 117-167. The image of Harold (possibly) being struck by an arrow in punishment for his perjury may have invited comparison with William Rufus, who Eadmer also shows to be a perjurer who is struck down by God's judgement. However, there is a debate as to whether the Tapestry even shows Harold being blinded, see: D. J. Bernstein, 'The Blinding of Harold and the Meaning of the Bayeux Tapestry', *ANS* 5 (1982), pp 40-64.

[49] *VA*, Preface: Quoniam multas et antecessorum nostrorum temporibus insolitas rerum mutationes nostris diebus in Anglia accidisse et coaluisse conspeximus, ne mutationes ipsae posterorum scientiam penitus laterent, quaedam ex illis succincte excerpta, litterarum memoriae tradidimus

[50] Southern, *Portrait*, p. 415.

[51] Southern, *Biographer*, p. 310. Southern writes: 'In a large sense it was true that the conflict between secular and ecclesiastical authorities on grounds of principle was something that distinguished the age from all previous ones.' This is perhaps not true as the history of events is portrayed in the *Historia* – Dunstan is another figure who is shown to engage in a similar conflict.

the *Historia*. In addition, the issue of investiture, which Eadmer then discusses in the *Preface* was not a cause of Anselm's first exile. The simple cause of Anselm's exiles, as is presented in the *Historia*, was his steadfast resistance to royal authority, which is depicted through a refusal to sin and disavow God.

The title of the *Historia Novorum in Anglia* may be relevant as the clearest statement of how Eadmer saw his work. Often translated as a 'History of Recent Events in England', a rudimentary, if less elegant translation would be 'A History of New (things) in England'. This would also reflect Eadmer's own emphases in both his *Prefaces*: on change and novelty.

Eadmer's vision of cyclical and new history may reflect ideas from Augustine of Hippo's view of the nature of history. Book twelve of *De civitate Dei* criticises the pagan notion that all of human history repeats itself indefinitely. Augustine points to God's creation of man and the world as disproving this theory of eternal circles, but argues that the wicked can never be 'new', writing:

> But in fact the writer is speaking of what he has just been mentioning: the successive generations, departing and arriving, the paths of the sun, the streams that flow past. Or else he is speaking generally of all things which come to be and pass away: for there were men before us, there are men contemporary with us, and there will be men after us; and the same holds good for all living creatures, and for trees and plants. Even the very monsters, the strange creatures which are born although different one from another, and even though we are told that some of them are unique, still, regarded as a class of wonders and monsters, it is true of them that they have been before and they will be again, and there is nothing novel [*novum*] or fresh in the fact of a monster being born under the sun.[52]

[52] Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, eds. Dombart & Kalb, Book XII, 14: quod ille aut de his rebus dixit, de quibus superius loquebatur, hoc est de generationibus aliis euntibus, aliis uenientibus, de solis anfractibus, de torrentium lapsibus; aut certe de omnium rerum generibus, quae oriuntur atque occidunt. Fuerunt enim homines ante nos, sunt et nobiscum, erunt et post nos; ita quaeque animantia uel arbusta. Monstra quoque ipsa, quae inusitata nascuntur, quamuis inter se diuersa sint et quaedam eorum semel facta narrentur, tamen secundum id, quod generaliter miracula et monstra sunt, utique et fuerunt et erunt, nec recens et nouum est, ut monstrum sub sole nascatur. Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, trans. H. Bettenson (London: Penguin Classics: 2003), Book XII, 14.

Augustine concludes that these 'false cycles' [*falsi circuitus*] can be avoided by walking on the right path [*trames recti itineris*] of the 'sane (that is, Christian) doctrine', arguing that sin (human error) causes the cycles to be open to misinterpretation. In the same chapter, Augustine explains that because of Christ's advent 'something new happened in time' [*fit aliquid novi in tempore*]. This same idea with the same terminology appears again, where Augustine states that when a soul comes to blessedness, this is a new thing in time [*aliquid novi in tempore*].[53] Chapter twelve of *De civitate Dei* argues that the existence of God disproves, innately, the theories of endless cycles, but leaves the wicked as doomed to repeating the same mistakes because of the sinful nature of fallen humanity.

Augustine's notion, that only those who walked on the right path of Christian doctrine could escape the endless loops of sin and escape from the trap of time may explain Eadmer's intent. The opening to the *Historia* may point to a similar conception. Certainly, history is not repeating itself exactly, but Eadmer's patterning of historic events on contemporary ones may suggest the same view of human sin as leading men to repeat the same mistakes throughout time. In the *Vita Anselmi*, Eadmer makes a clear link between 'strange and new signs' and the intervention of God in time, in this instance, punishing William Rufus for his sin.[54]

Aspects of this Augustinian line of thinking may have appeared in Anselm's conversation, as recorded by Eadmer. In the *Vita Anselmi*, Eadmer relates how Anselm explained the difference between the life of a secular man and that of a monk, using the metaphor of a millstone:

> And so it is, as I said, that the mill can be compared to the life of men. The grindstones are their actions. For as the grindstone goes round and round over the same course [*circuitu*] while it is grinding, so human actions repeat themselves as their time comes round. For example: men plough, they sow, they reap and grind, make bread and eat it. So the grindstone comes round full circle [*circuitum*].[55]

[53] J. van Oort, 'The end is now: Augustine on History and Eschatology', *Theological Studies* 68 (2012), pp. 1-7 at p. 4.

[54] *VA*, II, xlv: signis quae nova et inusitata.

[55] *VA*, II, xi: Itaque molendino assimiletur, ut dixi, vita hominum; molae actus eorum. Nam sicut mola, dum aliquid molit, in circuitu ducitur, et circumducta simili cursu saepe reducitur; sic et actus humani quibusque

Anselm uses a slightly different metaphor to Augustine's own 'circuits', suggesting that all men 'grind', but only monks reap the reward. Later within this same allegory, Anselm refers to human life as being like a river, which is likely taken from Augustine's use of an identical metaphor in *De trinitate*.[56] This view of human existence as being by nature repetitive, with only God offering a respite from the circle of sin, is not at odds with Anselmian thought.

Prophecy is significant to the opening to the *Historia* and Eadmer directly states in his opening that it is prophecy which is driving the narrative. Directly after Dunstan makes his prophecy of the coming disasters, Eadmer comments:

> How true proved this prophecy of the man of God can be all too easily seen both in… the happenings which the course of this present work will in their proper places portray and in our own afflictions by those who know how to discern them, not to mention the happenings which the course of this present work will in their proper places portray as truth shall dictate.[57]

Eadmer here indicates that he saw Dunstan's prophecy as not only referring to the Viking invasions, but also to the troubles of his present day.[58] After Eadmer has finished his account of the Viking invasions and Alfege's death, he repeats this same point:

> These events I have briefly described, not as though I were composing a history [*historia*] of those times, but rather as bringing them to the notice of those who care to know how true was the prophecy of Father Dunstan.[59]

---

temporibus in se revertuntur. Verbi gratia: Arant homines, seminant, metunt, molunt, panificant, comedunt. En circuitum suum mola peregit.

[56] *VA*, I, xxi, xi. Augustine, *De trinitate*, Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina; 62, Book 4, 16.21. R. A. Markus, *Saeculum: History and society in the theology of St. Augustine* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), p. 10.

[57] *HN*, p. 4. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 3: Quae prophetia viri Dei quam vera exstiterit, et in Chronicis, qui legere volunt, et in nostris tribulationibus qui advertere sciunt, videre facillime possunt, ne dicam in his quae istius operis series per loca, veritate dictante, demonstrabit.

[58] Southern, *Biographer*, p. 311.

[59] *HN*, p. 5. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 5: Haec paucis commemoraverim non historiam texens, sed quam veridico vaticinio Pater Dunstanus mala Angliae ventura praedixerit, scire volentium intellectui pandens.

Eadmer makes it clear that he is not attempting to record the Viking invasions as a chronicle of events, but rather as part of the fulfilment of Dunstan's prophecy. The implication of this comment is that the events on their own are unimportant and would have not merited inclusion if they had not been prophesied.

Although Eadmer does not make the same point during the account of Edward the Confessor's prophecy and the Norman invasions, the narrative is based around Edward's prophecy. The author explains how the hostages ended up in Normandy, then relates the prophecy and its fulfilment. Eadmer does not discuss other events significant to Canterbury during Edward the Confessor's rule, such as Robert of Jumieges' rule, which might have presented an opportunity to show a Canterbury archbishop advising a co-operative king. When reading the opening to the *Historia*, it is vital to look not just at what Eadmer chose to include, but also what he chose to omit. If Eadmer's account was driven solely by his interest in Canterbury advisors to the king, the narrative could look very different. In Lanfranc's case, Eadmer explains that he is giving an account in memory of the dead archbishop, and later explains that his chosen and set purpose is not to focus on Lanfranc, suggesting that the account is a digression. Eadmer then instantly turns to Anselm.[60] Lanfranc does not make a prophecy of future disaster, but Anselm does make one to William Rufus after the consecration. In this scene, Anselm warns the bishops that if they do not desist, the church will suffer as the king will dominate England.[61] This use of prophecy to drive a narrative, ignoring historical material which does not relate to these instances of foresight copies a theme from Augustine.[62]

The *Historia*, therefore, is a history which in its initial completed form focussed on saints and prophecy, and not on events as such. The lives of these saints are narrated in terms of their interactions with secular society, which has a variety of characters. The 'newness'

[60] Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 13: tamen pro dulcedine memoriae ejus, quae praelibavimus paucis explicare gratum duximus. *HN*, p. 24. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 23: Ego autem quia probabili et firma ratione, sicut cepi, in alia ducor…

[61] Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 36.

[62] Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, eds. Dombart & Kalb, Book XVI, 2. Augustine remarks that the scriptures may omit true historical material which has no bearing on prophetic foresight. Also see Markus' discussion of this, Markus, *Saeculum*, p. 191.

referred to in the title may reflect that the *Historia* was intended to follow the few holy men in England who were following the straight path of Christian doctrine and destined for a place in the City of God (Dunstan, Alfege and possibly Edward the Confessor). Eadmer may have seen the signs of the sanctity of these men reflected in their refusal to co-operate in the usual fashion with their kings, the novelty of Anselm's approach a sign of his sanctity.

The recurring appearance of prophecy and Eadmer's repeated assertion of its importance in guiding his narrative may add weight to this suggestion. Augustine explores the meanings of prophesies in sacred history, sacred history being different from profane history in that the former is prophetically inspired.[63] Augustine gives examples of prophecies from scripture which seem to parallel Eadmer's inclusion: 'Nathan the Prophet was sent to convict King David of a grave sin and to predict the coming misfortunes, misfortunes which in fact followed.'[64] It is clear that Eadmer's vision of prophecy is not dissimilar to Augustine's view of the same. However, Augustine was discussing prophecies in the scriptures, in the realm of sacred history, not secular history.[65]

Eadmer may have not seen this same firm division between these two categories. At the end of the *Vita Anselmi*, Eadmer writes:

[63] Markus, *Saeculum*, p. 15.

[64] Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, eds. Dombart & Kalb, Book XVII, 3: Missus est Nathan propheta, qui regem Dauid argueret de peccato graui et ei, quae consecuta sunt mala, futura praediceret. Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, trans. Bettenson, Book XVII, 3. In book seventeen of *de Civitate Dei*, Augustine writes that some prophecies refer to the earthly city, some to the heavenly city and others to both. Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, eds. Dombart & Kalb, Book XVII, 3: partim ergo ad ancillam, quae in seruitutem generat, id est terrenam Hierusalem, quae seruit cum filiis suis, partim uero ad liberam ciuitatem Dei, id est ueram Hierusalem aeternam in caelis, cuius filii homines secundum Deum uiuentes peregrinantur in terris; sed sunt in eis quaedam, quae ad utramque pertinere intelleguntur, ad ancillam proprie, ad liberam figurate. Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, trans. Bettenson, Book XVII, 3: Thus the prophecies refer in part to the maidservant whose children are born into slavery, that is, the earthly Jerusalem, who is in slavery, as are also her sons; but in part they refer to the free City of God, the true Jerusalem, eternal in heaven, whose sons are the men who live according to God's will in their pilgrimage on earth.

[65] See: Markus*, Saeculum*, p. 9.

> Here then I shall bring this small work to an end, first however giving all who deign to read or listen to it a brief warning not to allow their minds to be injured by any lack of belief in the things which have been described…[66]

Eadmer explains his sources and that much of the work was recorded from Anselm's words or from eye-witnesses. Having explained this, he continues:

> I affirm that it is a shocking thing for anyone knowingly to write what is false in sacred histories [*sacris historiis*].[67]

Eadmer was writing the story of a man whom he believed had been a living saint. The narrative of the *Historia* initially followed the lives of Dunstan, Edward the Confessor and Anselm, and all three prophesied in similar, almost identical ways. Dunstan was a recognised saint and Edward the Confessor had a growing cult. Eadmer himself admits that the account of Lanfranc is not within the immediate reach of his text. In Robert Markus' analysis, Augustine believed that a biblical writer may have had a mind enlightened by a special charisma which enabled him to reveal the hidden, inner meaning of events, the meaning that ordinary historical events bear within the overall pattern of God's saving work. The narrative would be historical in its form and substance, and prophetic in the manner in which the meaning of the historical narrative is displayed: *sacra historia*.[68] Eadmer may have attributed some sort of divine inspiration to Anselm which may explain the emphasis Eadmer placed on Anselm's private conversation.

The presence of what appears to be a speculative philosophy of history in Eadmer's text gives a vision of history which is related to Augustinian theology. Eadmer, however, was no great theologian, and his incorporation of theological themes appear to be dependent on Anselm's presence and influence. It seems unlikely, therefore, that this view of history is entirely Eadmer's creation and instead, may reveal some influence from Anselm. Anselm's theology is heavily influenced by Augustine. Early in his writing career, in the *Monologion*, Anselm composes without referring to his authorities, simply reassuring his readers in the

---

[66] *VA*, II, lxxi: Hinc fini praesens opusculum subdam; dum omnes id legere vel audire dignantes prius brevi commoneam quatenus nulla incredulitate ex iis quae descripta sunt mentem vulnerent.

[67] *VA*, II, lxxi: Falsa vero scienter aliquem in sacris historiis scribere nefas esse pronuntio.

[68] Markus, *Saeculum,* p. 195.

Preface that nothing that follows disagrees with Augustine.[69] Anselm was not a historian and did not write on history. However, the allegory of human life being like a millstone uses Augustine's terminology and may point at Anselm's vision of humanity as being circuitous, with human nature trapped by sin.[70] It is plausible that Eadmer's interest in history might have led to the two men discussing philosophies of history. The presence of Augustinian themes in Eadmer's presentation of history and time may represent Anselmian teaching about these topics.

Eadmer's presentation of recent history as a conflict between Anselm and his kings, especially in the reign of William Rufus, parallels *De civitate Dei*'s presentation of history as a conflict between the City of Man and the City of God. Augustine's insistence throughout *De civitate Dei* that God allowed the earthly city to dominate the heavenly city in order to identify those few holy men worthy of salvation adds to the sense that Anselm's conflict with his secular king was not only expected, but inevitable, given the strangeness of the true Christian to the world.[71] Many of the themes in the *Historia* build on this interpretation of the world as split into the City of God and the City of Men. As is explored later in this chapter, Eadmer employs a distinctly Anselmian view of rational wills, which itself was inspired by Augustine.[72] Anselm's own prophecy, made after he was forced to become archbishop further suggests that this Augustinian/Anselmian interpretation of overall events is accurate. In this prophecy, Anselm predicts:

> Do you not realise what it is that you are trying so hard to do? You are trying to harness together at the plough under one yoke an untamed bull and an old and feeble sheep. And what will come of it? Why, without doubt the untameable fury of the bull will drag the sheep…[73]

---

[69] Anselm, *Monologion*, Preface.

[70] *VA*, II, xi.

[71] Markus, *Saeculum*, pp. 165-169.

[72] E. Sweeney, *Anselm of Canterbury and the desire for the word* (Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2012), p. 69.

[73] *HN*, p. 36. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 36: Quid molimini? Indomitum taurum, et vetulam ac debilem ovem in aratro conjungere, sub uno jugo, disponitis. Et quid inde proveniet? Indomabilis utique feritas tauri, sic ovem lanae et lactis et agnorum fertilem per spinas et tribulos hac et illac raptam.

In this allegorical depiction of Anselm's partnership with William Rufus, Eadmer prefigures Anselm's failure as archbishop and his inability to tame this king.[74]

This prediction of the utter failure of the partnership between William Rufus and Anselm may contain an Augustinian explanation for the events. Eadmer's comparison of William Rufus to a bull and the use of this language to describe the king may have originated from Augustine of Hippo's *Expositions on Psalms*. In Augustine's exposition of Psalm 67:31, the author expands on the psalm's mention of 'bulls', and employs the same language as Eadmer in relation to these animals. In a single section of text, Augustine uses five Latin terms identical to Eadmer's, also describing the *taurus* as untamed, furious and unable to withstand the plough and yoke. Augustine discusses the allegory of bulls and of their divine purpose, and explains:

> Calling them bulls because of the pride of a stiff and untamed neck: for he is referring to heretics. But by the cows of the peoples, I think souls easily led astray must be understood, because easily they follow these bulls. For they lead not astray entire peoples, amongst whom are men grave and stable… To this useful purpose then Divide Providence alloweth bulls to be gathered together amongst the cows of the people, namely, in order that there may be excluded they that have been tried with silver. For to this end heresies are suffered to be, in order that approved men may be made manifest.[75]

Anselm was well-acquainted with the works of Augustine. There was a copy of Augustine's *Expositions* at Canterbury, and probably at Bec, and it is likely that both Anselm and Eadmer

[74] Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 37.

[75] Augustine, *Expositions on Psalms*, eds. P. Schaff & trans. J.E. Tweed (Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1888), Vol. 8, 68, 36: Tauros vocans, propter superbiam durae indomitaeque cervicis; significat enim haereticos. *Vaccas* autem *populorum,* seductibiles animas intelligendas puto, quia facile sequuntur hos tauros. Non enim populos universos seducunt, in quibus sunt graves et stabiles… Ad hanc ergo utilitatem, Providentia divina permittit tauros congregari inter vaccas populorum*,* ut *excludantur,* id est, ut emineant *qui probati sunt argento.* Ad hoc enim haereses sinuntur esse, *ut probati manifesti fiant.*

were familiar with the text.[76] Augustine's comment that bulls can easily lead astray souls fits with the broader depiction of William Rufus in the *Historia* as a person who coerced and led others into sin, either through threating behaviour or bribery. The explanation that God allowed William Rufus to become king so that holy men could be identified by their refusal to be led astray also fits with Eadmer's assessment of contemporary events. Eadmer's description of Anselm as a lone soul standing against the king and his followers in his determination to follow God's will may identify Anselm as one of those people who were 'excluded' from those who followed the bull. This allusion to this theme corresponds with an Augustinian vision of the purpose of wickedness as distinguishing those who belong to the City of God.

There may be a further parallel to Augustine's writings as Eadmer may have been suggesting that William Rufus was a king with 'libido dominandi'. Augustine discusses this in relation to pagan rulers in the *De civitate Dei* (Book 3, chapters 14 and 15). These two chapters explore themes of inter-familial conflict and the usurpation of thrones (for instance, in the case of Romulus and Remus). Further, Augustine asserts that kings with 'libido dominandi' tended to have frightful ends. Although Eadmer does not explicitly identify William Rufus as having 'libido dominandi', the description of William Rufus' lust for power and violent death may suggest at least an intention to highlight similarities.[77]

This cyclic view of history does not only form a vision of history and time, but may also have been used to justify Anselm's actions and policies. It is notable that in these historic cases, Eadmer presents an ideal counsel which is non-coercive in form and resembles Anselm's own style of counsel. In Eadmer's description of contemporary events Anselm offers counsel but refuses to take aggressive actions, such as excommunication, to discipline William Rufus.[78] The historic figures in the *Historia* offer advice, but do not force their lords to act on this counsel. In Dunstan's case, King Edgar follows his archbishop's counsel apparently out of free will and Dunstan is not shown attempting to curb forcefully King Ethelred's

[76] G. E. M. Gasper, *Anselm of Canterbury and his theological inheritance* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), pp. 206-210. R. Gameson, *The Earliest Books of Canterbury Cathedral: Manuscripts and Fragments to c. 1200* (London: The Bibliographical Society and The British Library, 2008).

[77] Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, eds. Dombart & Kalb, Book III, chapters 14 & 15.

[78] Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 111. Also in Anselm's Letter 210. Anselm, *Ep.* 210.

disobedience.[79] In other texts, even those also written by Eadmer, the depictions of Dunstan's typical style of rulership differ from the account in the *Historia*. Eadmer vividly describes a scene in his *Vita Dunstani* where Dunstan drags King Eadwig out of his bedchamber to attend church, but these themes are not duplicated in the *Historia*.[80] Edward the Confessor's statement that he has no intention of interfering in Harold's departure is another example of Eadmer's presentation of good counsel as being non-coercive in form.[81] Eadmer's historic kings are expected to rule by 'sancti leges' and accept guidance from their advisors.[82] Eadmer's use of 'sanctis' reinforces the idea that secular laws ought to obey religious principles, in a style which is similar to Anselm's own arguments.[83] Eadmer's model of how kings and advisors ought to co-operate appears to be modelled on Anselm's own behaviour.

Further to this, there are multiple examples of advisor-figures struggling with uncooperative kings in the opening of the *Historia*: Dunstan grapples with Ethelred, Edward the Confessor's advice is roundly dismissed by Harold Godwinson and Lanfranc has trouble with William Rufus. Yet, both Dunstan and Lanfranc are shown to be very successful with their first kings, and it is clear that these men are capable ecclesiastics when they are able to work with willing kings. The successes and failures of these holy men do not depend on their characters or the quality of their advice, but rather entirely on whether their lord will accept and act on that advice. This inclusion of these famous saints in similar situations to Anselm's own may have been intended to establish both the precedence for Anselm's actions and have further moved the burden of responsibility for the troubles of Anselm's career onto the shoulders of his kings.

---

[79] Eadmer, *Historia*, pp. 3-4.

[80] *VD*, p. 98.

[81] Eadmer, *Historia,* p. 6.

[82] Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 3.

[83] William Rufus is recorded as objecting to Anselm's assertion that he had promised to hold the king's laws only as they agreed with God's will. Anselm replied: 'Indeed! If, as you say, no mention was made then either of God or of right, of what was mention made? God forbid, God forbid I say, that any Christian should hold or defend laws which are known to be contrary to God and to right.' *HN*, p. 88. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 84: Pape, si nec Dei nec rectitudinis mentio, ut dicitis, facta fuit, cujus tunc? Absit ab omni Christiano, absit, leges vel consuetudines tenere, aut tueri, quae Deo et rectitudini contrariae esse noscuntur.

The inclusion of the career of Archbishop Alfege in the opening of this text introduces a third archbishop of Canterbury, whose career forms part of Eadmer's narration of the Viking invasions and the consequences of Dunstan's prophecy. Alfege is an interesting case as he was celebrated for a military and diplomatic failure which ultimately claimed his life. Alfege's story has a relationship with Anselm as Eadmer recorded that Anselm constructed the saint's defence.[84] In the *Historia*, Alfege is martyred when he refuses to succumb to threats against his life. Eadmer's account of Alfege's career explains that Alfege 'set himself in every possible way to see how he could counter the cruelty of such godless men'. Alfege's enemies see this, then burn Canterbury and murder Alfege. Despite failing to resist the 'godless men', Alfege is celebrated as a saint for holding fast to Christian ideals and willing truth and justice.[85] The inclusion of Alfege's martyrdom may be intended to remind the reader that resistance to evil in itself can be worthy of veneration, and to highlight the importance of good lordship to the role of archbishop. The use of parallel terminology to describe Alfege's refusal to despoil his men and Anselm's own refusal, as discussed in chapter two, may be part of this parallel. The inclusion of this third archbishop's career may have been intended to exempt Anselm from charges of incompetence and of failing to adequately control his king.

The Wills of God, Anselm and Man

Eadmer's account of Anselm's early career in books one and two is mostly concerned with the archbishop's struggle against William Rufus. Anselm's refusal to co-operate with William Rufus' demands is described from start to finish, through Anselm's unhappy consecration, the early quarrels between the two men, the process of the Council of Rockingham and eventually to Anselm's exile and William Rufus' death. To explain the conflict, Eadmer draws heavily on Anselmian ideas of will: the competing wills of God and man, the ability of rational creatures to will either for self-interest or for justice and the nature of free will. This framework of Anselmian thought is used to interpret contemporary events, and to cast Anselm as a religious man battling against a host of irreligious enemies. Many of

[84] *VA*, I, xxx.

[85] *HN,* p. 5. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 4: et quibus poterat modis operam dare coepit quemadmodum immanitati nefandorum hominum possit obviari.

these themes may have been expected to appear in Anselm's reported speech and actions, but also appear in the speech and actions of Anselm's enemies. Eadmer's incorporation of an Anselmian interpretation of events permeates the entire narrative, and is used to create a coherent defence of Anselm's actions.

God as supreme

Anselm's own explanation of his conflict with King William Rufus and a defence of his non-cooperation is present in Letter 210, which is addressed to Pope Paschal II. Writing in 1099 or 1100, Anselm states that: 'The king demanded of me that in the name of righteousness, I should give my consent to his intentions which were against the law and will of God'.[86] The theme of the king demanding obedience when his will was against God's continues throughout the letter. Anselm explains the offences which were against God's will and writes: 'Everyone in the kingdom, even my own suffragan bishops, refused to give me any counsel except that which agreed with the king's will.'[87] Anselm then states that he chose to go into exile rather than allow these offences to continue under his rule.[88] Later in the letter, Anselm entreats the pope not to order him to return without a change in the political circumstances:

> I pray and beseech you, with as much fervour as I can, not to command me to return to England under any circumstances, unless in such a way that I be allowed to place the law and will of God and the Apostolic decrees above the will of man…[89]

[86] Anselm, *Ep.* 210: Exigebat enim a me rex ut voluntatibus suis, quae contra legem et voluntatem Dei erant, sub nomine rectitudinis assensum praeberem.

[87] Anselm, *Ep* 210: In omnibus his et similibus si consilium petebam, omnes de regno ejus etiam suffraganei mei episcopi negabant se consilium daturos, nisi secundum voluntatem. These offences pertain to William's refusal to recognise the Pope, his lack of church councils and the king's gifting of Church lands to his followers.

[88] Richard Southern saw this exile as Anselm's reaction to an impossible situation after he was forced into the role of archbishop. Southern, *Biographer*, p. 161. An alternative view of Anselm acting in a more calculated way is offered in S. N. Vaughn, *Anselm of Bec and Robert of Meulan: The Innocence of the Dove and the Wisdom of the Serpent* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), pp. 204-7.

[89] Anselm, *Ep.* 210: Precor igitur et obsecro quanto possum affectu, ut nullo modo in Angliam redire iubeatis, nisi ita ut legem et voluntatem dei et decreta apostolica voluntati hominis liceat mihi praeferre.

Anselm finishes his letter by commenting that although he has been advised by some to excommunicate the king for these offences, he believes that this action would be: 'scorned by him (King William Rufus) and turned into ridicule'.[90] In this letter, Anselm presents his inability to co-operate with William Rufus in terms of a conflict between human will and law, and those of God and intended by God for humanity. Anselm has to obey God's eternal laws over the arbitrary and temporal ones dictated by an earthly king. This juxtaposition the self-will alongside God's will, which is both truth and justice, is a common theme in Anselm's theological writings, and here is brought to use in defence of his resistance to royal control over church business.[91]

In the *Historia* and particularly during the account of the council of Rockingham, Eadmer adopts the justification used by Anselm in Letter 210 and presents the conflict in terms of God's will over Man's, borrowing heavily from Anselm's terminology. This is not just present in Anselm's reported speech; Eadmer uses the characters of the bishops and king to highlight Anselm's arguments, framing their responses to suggest that in asking for Anselm to obey his dictates over church policy, William Rufus was consciously asking Anselm to turn away from God. In almost all of the bishops' responses to Anselm's arguments at Rockingham, they demand that Anselm render obedience to William Rufus with no regard to anyone or anything else. Eadmer does not have them state that this 'anything else' is God at this point, but it can be inferred; later in the *Historia*, the bishops object to the law of God having any bearing on the king's customs.[92] Eadmer reports that the bishops at Rockingham admit that, as a result of their obedience to William Rufus, they cannot give advice to Anselm in accordance with the will of God if this conflicts with the will of the king. One example of the typical reply which Eadmer attributes to the bishops is as follows:

> The answer which we gave to you yesterday we give you again today, which is, that if you are willing without any reserve to turn around and devote your whole mind to the service of our lord, then we will give you prompt and unambiguous advice, advice which we have found by experience to be serviceable where we ourselves are

[90] Anselm, *Ep.* 210: Mandatum mihi est quia mea excommunicatio, si fieret, ab illo contemneretur et in derisum converteretur.

[91] Anselm, *De casu diaboli,* 4, 7, 14. Anselm, *De libertate arbitrii*, 2, 5, 8, 10.

[92] Eadmer, *Historia*, pp. 55-6.

> concerned. But, if what you are looking for from us is advice in accordance with the Will of God which might be any way contrary to the Will of the king, then your asking is but lost labour, you will never see us upholding you in any way such as this.[93]

This example occurs, similarly worded, in many instances throughout the account of the Council of Rockingham, with the same emphasis on the conflict between the king's will and God's will.[94] Eadmer's account presents the bishops demanding Anselm's absolute and exclusive obedience to the will of the king, which they are following. In one of many cases where the king refers to his own will in this scene, William Rufus commands these bishops to condemn Anselm: 'at my will'.[95]

In the *Historia*, Eadmer formulates the episcopal and royal opposition to Anselm's position using Anselmian thought, but he appears to move beyond the official position adopted by Anselm in Letter 210, driving Anselm's more moderate complaints about the unruly king to their obvious conclusion. Anselm's account in Letter 210 identifies that the king's will is against God's, but at no point suggests that the William Rufus is pursuing this course of action out of deliberate impiety. Eadmer presents William Rufus as consciously attempting to claim pre-eminence of will within his kingdom, which can only belong to God. Elaborating on this theme at his account of Rockingham, Eadmer suggests that the king was in a way jealous of the pre-eminence of God's will. In the *Historia,* Eadmer writes:

> The King had, as is well known, the idea that he did not possess his royal dignity intact so long as anyone anywhere throughout his whole land was said to have any

[93] *HN*, pp. 57-58. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 56: Quod heri respondimus modo respondemus; scilicet, si pure ad voluntatem domini regis consilii tui summam transferre volueris, promptum et quod in nobis ipsis utile didicimus a nobis consilium certum habebis. Si autem secundum Deum quod ullatenus voluntati regis obviare possit consilium a nobis expectas, frustra niteris, quia in huiusmodi nunquam tibi nos adminiculari videbis.

[94] Eadmer, *Historia*, pp. 56-61. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 59: In cunctis actibus tuis voluntatem domini regis et jussionem expecta (*HN*, p. 60: in all your actions have regard solely to the will of your lord the king and to his bidding).

[95] *HN*, p. 64. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 62: Ite, consiliamini; quia per vultum Dei si vos illum ad voluntatem meam non damnaveritis, ego damnabo vos. (By the face of God, if you do not at my will condemn him, I will condemn you).

> possession or any power which was not derived from the King himself, even were it ascribed to the Will of God.[96]

The theme of William Rufus as a king who is attempting to usurp the position of God in his kingdom is developed still further in the *Historia* after the Council of Rockingham, and especially after Anselm is exiled. In an extended description of William Rufus' unchristian behaviour, Eadmer comments that:

> The king had developed such mental self-exaltation that he could not even bear to hear anyone say when speaking of any business to be undertaken by the king or at his command, that the doing of it was subject to the Will of God. All acts, whether done or yet to be done, he wished to be ascribed solely to his own initiative and determination.[97]

Elsewhere, William Rufus objects to the verdict of a trial by ordeal, decreeing that his own judgement should come before God's, which William Rufus complains: 'inclines to one side or the other'.[98] Eadmer appears to have expanded on Anselm's initial explanation of conflicting wills, to place William Rufus as consciously seeking ultimate authority in his kingdom as both judge and ruler, above the position of God. These themes of William Rufus as a jealous and consciously impious man are entirely absent from Anselm's letter, which does not explain any specific reason for William Rufus' opposition.

Eadmer's portrayal of the conflict between William Rufus and Anselm may have been influenced by theological texts written by Anselm, which are not directly related to the situation in England. Anselm's tract, *De casu diaboli*, discusses the Devil's fall in terms of willing; Anselm explains that by willing what God did not want him to will, the Devil willed to

---

[96] *HN*, p. 61. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 60: Nec enim regia dignitate integre se potitum suspicabatur, quamdiu aliquis it tota terra sua, vel etiam secundum Deum, nisi per eum quicquam habere, nota dico, vel posse dicebatur.

[97] *HN*, p. 105. Eadmer, *Historia,* p. 101: Praeter haec quoque per id temporis ferebatur eum in tantam mentis elationem corruisse, ut nequaquam patienter audire valeret, si quivis ullum negotium quod vel a se vel ex suo praecepto foret agendum poneret sub conditione voluntatis Dei fieri; sed quaeque, acta simul et agenda, suae soli industriae ac fortitudini volebat ascribe.

[98] *HN*, p. 106. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 102: Quare per hoc et hoc meo judicio amodo respondebitur. Non Dei quod pro voto cujusque hinc inde plicatur.

be greater than God, as he sought to put his will above that of God's.[99] Eadmer never explicitly identifies William Rufus as a devil-like figure, but, William Rufus' jealousy of God and the king's attempts to usurp God's position and Eadmer's narration of this in terms of wills strongly implies a parallel to the fall of the Devil.

Two Wills of Rational Creatures

Eadmer may have been further influenced by other theories in *De casu diaboli*. In this text, Anselm identifies two distinct types of willing; a rational creature can either will for justice or for what is advantageous for it.[100] In the *Historia*, Anselm's will is consistently presented as corresponding with God's will and God's law, and William Rufus' is presented as opposing this mutual will of Anselm and God. In creating a narrative of the dispute in the *Historia*, Eadmer frequently employs polar terms to build his argument. The account places the will of the king in opposition to the will of God, and also compares Anselm's 'justice' to 'that creature's (the king's) injustice'.[101] This repeated use of contradictory terms is very reminiscent of Anselm's own style in his three treatises on will, where Anselm's theological

[99] Anselm, *De casu diaboli*, 4: T. Even if he did not will to be altogether equal to God, but contrary to the will of God willed to be something less than God, then even in this case he willed inordinately to be like God; for he willed something by an autonomous will, which was subject to no one else. For it ought to be the characteristic only of God so to will something by an autonomous will that He is not subordinate to a higher will. S. That's right. T. However, not only did [the Devil] will to be equal to God because he presumed to have an autonomous will, but he even willed to be greater [than God] by willing what God did not will him to will, for he placed his will above the will of God. - MAG. Etiamsi noluit omnino par esse Deo, sed aliquid minus Deo, contra voluntatem Dei, hoc ipso voluit inordinate similis esse Deo, quia propria voluntate, quae nulli subdita fuit, voluit aliquid. Solius enim Dei esse debet, sic voluntate propria velle aliquid, ut superiorem non sequatur voluntatem. DISC. Ita est. MAG. Non solum autem voluit esse aequalis Deo, quia praesumpsit habere propriam voluntatem; sed etiam major voluit esse, volendo quod Deus illum velle nolebat, quoniam voluntatem suam supra voluntatem Dei posuit.

[100] Anselm, *De casu diaboli*, 4: T. But [the Devil] was able to will nothing except what is just or beneficial. For happiness, which every rational nature wills, consists of benefits. MAG. Nihil autem velle poterat nisi justitiam, aut commodum: ex commodis enim constat beatitudo, quam vult omnis rationalis natura.

[101] *HN*, p. 102. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 98: factum est ut et viri justitia firmius crederetur, et injustitia hominis eum non aequo judicio fatigantis...

world view is built on a system where in every case there are two opposing positions: the right will or the wrong will, truth or a lie, freedom or slavery, justice or injustice, with many of these terms being fairly interchangeable.[102] Eadmer may be attempting to incorporate Anselm's theory of the two wills of rational creatures into his text, and establish William Rufus as the foil to Anselm's correct will and behaviour.

Eadmer often presents these two wills in terms of the character either willing for God or for the world, the two utterly incompatible with each other. Anselm's refusal to will for his own self-interest is shown to be a principal cause of his inability to work with the other bishops and his king. The bishops themselves explain to Anselm that his right will is the principal cause of their dispute:

> My lord Father, we know that you are a man of piety and holiness and that your conversation is in heaven. But for ourselves, encumbered as we are by our kinsfolk whom we support and by the manifold interests of this world which are dear to us, we cannot, we confess, rise to the sublime height of your life and scorn this world as you do. If you are willing to come down to our level and travel with us in the way in which we walk, then we will consider your interests as we do your own and to your problems, whatever they may be, will when needed devote all the care which we do to our own. But if as so far you have done, you still choose to hold fast to God and to him alone, then so far as we are concerned, in so doing, as up to now you have been quite alone, so will you continue to be from now on.[103]

Eadmer's presentation of will is starkly divided. The bishops who ask Anselm to travel their way [*via nobiscum pergere*] depict Anselm's choice as simple, between God and the world.

---

[102] Anselm, *De veritate*, 12, 13. See discussion of issues of tensions and paradoxes in Anselm's writing: Sweeney, *Anselm of Canterbury and the desire for the word*. See particularly, pp. 110-175.

[103] *HN*, p. 86. Eadmer, *Historia*, pp. 82-83: Domine Pater, scimus te virum religiosum esse ac sanctum, et in coelis conversationem tuam. Nos autem impediti consanguineis nostris, quos sustentamus, et multiplicibus saeculi rebus, quas amamus, fatemur, ad sublimitatem vitae tuae surgere nequimus, nec huic mundo tecum illudere. Sed si volueris ad nos usque descendere, et qua incedimus via nobiscum pergere, nos tibi sicut nobis ipsis consulemus, et negotiis tuis quaecunque fuerint, ubi opus fuerit, sicut nostris, opem feremus. Si vero te ad Deum solummodo quemadmodum coepisti tenere delegeris solus, quantum nostra interest in hoc ut hactenus fuisti et amodo eris.

They are also shown here to understand that their 'interests of this world' are against the will of God. This identification of the different ends of Anselm and the bishops clearly divides Anselm from his peers.

The Will for Self-interest

In the *Historia*, the king is shown as controlling the actions of the bishops and princes using a mixture of bribery and intimidation. Explosions of rage are the king's default reaction to any slight deviance from his will. In the text, Eadmer describes William Rufus as 'stifling his anger', speaking 'in hot anger', the king is 'exceedingly angry', and 'incensed'.[104] In addition to this boiling rage, William Rufus openly uses threats of violence, one example being when Eadmer describes the king warning Anselm's messenger that if he did not leave the country immediately, the king would condemn him to have his eyes torn out.[105] This threatening behaviour becomes central to Eadmer's portrayal of the king's near-absolute control over his subjects. In the case of the council of Rockingham, as it appears in the *Historia*, William Rufus is shown to have personally questioned each bishop to ascertain their loyalty.[106] Eadmer then explains what happened to those who refused to openly disobey Anselm: 'He (William) angrily relegated (them) to a corner of the house far from him and bade them there await his sentence of condemnation.'[107] Eadmer then continues:

> Terrified and covered with confusion upon confusion they retired into a corner of the house: but very soon they had recourse to that safe and familiar plan of action on

[104] *HN*, p. 66. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 64: ille repressa sustinuit ira… *HN*, p. 26. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 25: furore succensus. *HN*, p. 59. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 58: vehementer iratus. *HN*, p. 45. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 44: iratus. *HN*, p. 67

[105] Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 110.

[106] *HN*, p. 66. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 65.

[107] *HN*, p. 66. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 65: ut perfidos ac suae voluntatis inimicos procul in angulo domus sententiam suae damnationis ira permotus jussit praestolari.

> which they were accustomed to rely, that is, they gave a large present of money and so were taken back into the king's favour.[108]

William Rufus is shown attempting to influence Anselm using identical methods, but he refuses to submit and to act against his convictions. At an early stage of Anselm's dispute with William Rufus, Eadmer explains how William Rufus was advised to deal with Anselm's dissent. After the new archbishop refuses to pay his king more than a sum of money that had been offered freely, unnamed followers advise the king to:

> 'Hold your hand a little and assume a look of displeasure towards him (Anselm) and you will see that he will be frightened just as others are and to regain your favour will be only too glad to add to the five hundred he now offers…' Indeed the king was himself in the habit of treating in this way all those over whom he ruled…[109]

Anselm is shown as unintimated by this posturing, which leads to him falling out of favour with his king and eventually leads to Anselm being forced to go into exile.

In Eadmer's account of events, Anselm alone resists the king's threats, where the other bishops concede to the king's demands out of fear. This yielding to the king's will represents the group of bishops as willing their own personal benefit instead of God's will, as they act out of a desire to maintain their personal safety and keep the king's favour. Eadmer makes it clear that these bishops completely understand that the king's will is in opposition to God's will. Their repeated claims to be unable to advise Anselm in accordance with God's will casts these characters as complicit in the king's deliberate and open disregard of God's will.

This account of the bishops as siding with William Rufus purely out of self-interest is not present in Anselm's own letters. Letter 210, which has already been discussed, contains

---

[108] *HN*, p. 66. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 65: Territi ergo et confusione super confusionem induti in angulum domus secesserunt. Sed reperto statim salubri et quo niti solebant domestico consilio, hoc est, data copiosa pecunia, in amicitiam regis recepti sunt. There may also be some thematic parallels with Anselm's *Meditatio ad concitandum timorem*, which describes paralysing fear at the thought of sin.

[109] *HN*, p. 44. Eadmer, *Historia*, pp. 43-44: Sed paululum sustine, faciemque tuam super eo commuta, et videbis quod consueto aliorum ductus terrore, ovans ad tuam benignita tem recuperandam quingentis quas offert totidem libras adjiciet. Siquidem hunc ipse rex morem erga cunctos quibus dominator.

Anselm's full interpretation of the dispute, written after he had been forced into exile. It portrays a coherent vision of the events which led to Anselm's exile, explaining that the bishops refused to give Anselm counsel which disagreed with the king's will. However, Anselm also wrote letters around the time of the council of Rockingham. In most of these contemporary letters, Anselm does not mention the bishops or refers to them only in passing. In one letter, written in the summer of 1095, Anselm referred to claims made by his ecclesiastical colleagues that their disobedience at the council was justified because of controversy surrounding Anselm's investiture by a schismatic king. Anselm discussed this problem at some length in this letter, attempting to refute any suggestion of his misconduct.[110] In the *Historia*, however, Eadmer makes no mention of any of the bishops' accusations which were raised by Anselm in his own letter, which hint at wider and legitimate concerns surrounding Anselm's conduct in accepting the position of archbishop. In the *Historia*, Eadmer reduces the bishops to an extension of the king's arm, and portrayed their actions as being purely fuelled by self-interest. This dispute appears as one between just two figures, Anselm and William Rufus, and between just two wills, that of God and of man. This simplification of events may have enabled Eadmer to incorporate Anselm's vision of the will of rational beings. It removes the bishops' objections from the account, but also depicts them as invalid, as the disobedience originated from an impious will.

The bishops' use of money to buy the king's favour forms part of a wider vision of the misuse of money in the *Historia*. Eadmer's presentation of money is generally highly negative; money tends to be associated with bribery and greed, and there are many instances where money is associated with moral corruption or is explicitly misused in this text.[111] William Rufus is one key character who is presented as being driven by a will for money, but similar charges are levelled at other characters and are put into similar terms. As already mentioned, Eadmer narrates the king's demands for excessive 'gifts' of money from Anselm and elsewhere in the *Historia*, Eadmer recounts details of William Rufus' extremely avaricious behaviour, such as the king pressuring recently converted Jews to return to their former religion in exchange for money.[112] Eadmer's tendency to counter-balance the will for money against a will for justice

[110] Anselm, *Ep.* 192.

[111] See select examples from book 1: Eadmer, *Historia*, pp. 4, 6, 7, 26-28, 40, 43-45, 50-52, 65.

[112] Eadmer, *Historia*, pp. 99-101.

and God may suggest he is using the former to signify the subject willing its own personal advantage.[113]An example of this occurs during Anselm's early struggles with the king and the pope, where Anselm complains: 'If Rome thinks more of gold and silver than of justice…'[114] This is an ongoing theme throughout the *Historia*. The only two individuals who consistently appear to be able to use money correctly are Archbishops Lanfranc and Anselm.[115] Lanfranc and Anselm's correct use of money (which is always depicted in the form of charity) may highlight the significance of will to the correct use of money, as the charity of these holy men directly demonstrates their will for justice.

Willing self-interest: Sin and Free Will

Eadmer champions those characters who do not display a desire for money, even those who are laymen. In book three, Eadmer explains that Robert Curthose had 'sunk so low in the general estimation', because:

> Piety and a lack of desire for worldly wealth, both of which qualities were prominent in Robert's character, had produced this estimation of him. Consequently on the coming of the King almost all the chiefs of the Normans, deserting their lord the Duke and abandoning the allegiance which they owed to him, immediately came running after the King's gold and silver…[116]

At first glance, this passage seems a critique of Duke Robert's weak rule, but a closer analysis suggests that it is actually a condemnation of the behaviour of Duke Robert's chiefs. The Norman noblemen ought to will justice, which Eadmer suggests they 'owed' to Duke Robert.

[113] Eadmer narrates William Rufus' despoliation of the Church due to his desire for its wealth, as well as his attempts to extract money out of Anselm: Eadmer, *Historia*, pp. 26-27, 40-41, 43-46.

[114] *HN*, p. 72. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 69: Si aurum et argentum Roma praeponit justitiae. This bares comparison with Osbern's use of identical themes in his *Vita Dunstani*, see chapter 4.

[115] See discussion: G. E. M. Gasper, 'Money and its use in the thought and experience of Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury (1093–1109)', *Journal of Medieval History* 38:2 (2012), pp. 155-182.

[116] *HN*, p. 176. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 165: Pium etenim cor et terrenarum rerum minima cupido, quae in eo juxta vigebant, hoc ei pepererant. Omnes igitur ferme Northmannorum majores illico ad regis adventum, spreto comite domino suo, et fidem quam ei debebant postponentes, in aurum et argentum regis cucurrerunt.

Instead, these noblemen chose to will for their own self-interest, which here is represented in the form of silver and gold. Eadmer may be identifying Duke Robert as a correctly-willing layman, who is unwilling to bribe his noblemen.

This use of bribery appears frequently in Eadmer's account of Anselm's interactions with William Rufus and is portrayed in ways which reflect influence from Anselm's philosophical texts. Anselm's *De libertate arbitrii* may be key to understanding Eadmer's presentation of the bribery in the *Historia*. In Eadmer's account of the early stages of the dispute between Anselm and William Rufus, Eadmer describes how William Rufus repeatedly demanded money from Anselm. Eadmer explains that Anselm had freely offered William Rufus a gift of money after a suggestion by his friends. However, the king was not satisfied with the offered amount and demands further money and Eadmer explains how Anselm defended his refusal to co-operate: 'And God forbid no less this too, that I should shew by act of mine that my Lord's love is a thing that can be bought'.[117] At an earlier stage in the text, Eadmer describes Anselm's fuller justification as why he cannot concede to the king's demands as Anselm tells William Rufus:

> It is, I assure you, better for you, yes and more honourable, to receive from me little and often, given as the free gifts of a friend, rather than take from me much all at once by force and extortion, treating me as if I were a slave. Grant me freedom and friendship and you can have me and all that is mine at your service; but, treat me as a slave and you will have neither me nor mine.[118]

Anselm refuses to agree to William Rufus' demands in these terms.

This account of the king's efforts and Anselm's refusal may have been influenced by the text of *De libertate arbitrii*, which outlines Anselm's theories of free will. In this treatise, Anselm explains that free will is not the power to sin or not to sin, but that: 'Accordingly, since

[117] *HN*, p. 52. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 51: Nihilo quoque minus hoc absit a me, amorem domini mei facto ostendere.

[118] *HN*, p. 45. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 45: Et fateor, utilius tibi est et honestius a me pauca cum amica libertate, et saepe suscipere, quam violenta exactione mihi multa simul sub servili conditione auferre. Amica nempe libertate me et omnia mea ad utilitatem tuam habere poteris, servili autem conditione nec me nec mea habebis.

all freedom is ability, that freedom of choice is the ability to keep uprightness-of-will for the sake of this uprightness itself.'[119]Anselm's treatise emphasises that no rational creature can be 'forced' to sin unwillingly. In chapter two of this treatise, Anselm uses an analogy to explain how free will, slavery and resistance to temptation work:

> But as for its seeming to you to follow that if either one were able to be a servant of sin, sin was able to master him and, thus, that neither he nor his choice was free: it is not true [that it follows. Consider,] for example, someone who has it in his power not to serve and whom no other power can force to serve, even though he can serve by his own power. As long as he uses not his power-to-serve but rather his power-not-to-serve, nothing can force him to serve.[120]

In Anselm's thinking, only right will is 'free' and although one who sins becomes a slave of sin, this slavery has to be first willed by the subject. Anselm's response to William Rufus follows this interpretation, as Anselm says that the king should be happy to receive gifts from Anselm (in the form of generosity and therefore in right will), rather than attempt to force Anselm to sin (treating him as if he were a slave to sin). Although Anselm would be sinning by buying his advantage from his king, Anselm's insistence that it would be 'better for you' hints at the collusive nature of bribery, as through this exchange, both men would sin. William Rufus is willing his personal benefit by seeking money, and through his actions is also encouraging Anselm to sin. Similarly, by accepting the demand of his king, Anselm would be enabling William Rufus' sin as well as seeking his own personal benefit.

In contrast to William Rufus' habit of threatening his followers to encourage them to follow his will, it is significant that at no stage does Anselm similarly resort to anger or to threats, even to warn the king or bishops of the wrath of God. Anselm instead requests the counsel of the bishops and explains his case in full then asks for their advice. Although the bishops ought to give Anselm good counsel, Anselm never orders the bishops to do this. This

---

[119] Anselm, *De libertate arbitrii*, 3: Ergo quoniam omnis libertas est potestas; illa libertas arbitrii est potestas servandi rectitudinem voluntatis propter ipsam rectitudinem.

[120] Anselm, *De libertate arbitrii*, 2: Quod autem consequi tibi videtur quia si potuit servus esse peccati, potuit ei dominari peccatum; et ideo nec illum, nec ejus arbitrium liberum fuisse: non ita est. Etenim qui suae potestatis est ut non serviat, nec alienae potestatis est ut serviat, quamvis potestate sua servire possit; quandiu non illa quae est serviendi, sed illa quae est non serviendi, utitur potestate, nulla res potest illi dominari, ut serviat.

may reflect teaching in *De veritate* to the effect that if a rational creature wills something good out of any compulsion, this is not willing rightly:

> By contrast, someone who wills what he ought to will but does so only if compelled to or only if induced by external rewards, does not keep uprightness-of-will for its own sake but keeps it for the sake of something else.[121]

Anselm deals with this question fully in *De veritate*; in chapter twelve, Anselm gives the example of a thief being forced to return money he has stolen, and explains that the thief is not willing correctly.[122] Had Eadmer depicted Anselm using threats or compelling the bishops to side with him, then even though Anselm would have taken action to force the bishops to will rightly, they would not have been willing freely and for the sake of rectitude, and therefore, their good action would be meaningless. This is contrasted against William Rufus' threatening behaviour, which invokes the sinning of others, encouraging them to abandon free will and become slaves to sin as they follow William Rufus' self-will.

The Will for God

As the primary exemplar in the *Historia*, Anselm often represents the sole character who has a correct will, willing only for God and for justice. This corresponds with Eadmer's overall presentation of humanity, as able to will either self-benefit or justice. Beyond this central theme of Anselm consistently willing God's will or for justice, there are a number of nuances of Anselm's character which may reflect ideas from Anselmian theology. Eadmer's picture of Anselm's relative weakness, mercy and mild nature may be drawn from ideas in Anselmian theology, and is used to create further contrast between the characters of Anselm and his opponents.

[121] Anselm, *De veritate*, 12: Justus namque, cum vult quod debet, servat voluntatis rectitudinem non propter aliud, inquantum justus est, quam propter ipsam rectitudinem. Qui autem nonnisi coactus, aut extranea mercede conductus, vult quod debet (si servare dicendus est rectitudinem) non eam servat propter ipsam, sed propter aliud.

[122] Anselm, *De veritate*, 12.

Throughout the *Historia*, Eadmer makes Anselm's will for justice clear, such as where Anselm refuses to will his own safety or personal benefit during his conflict with William Rufus. In Eadmer's presentation of Anselm's behaviour, the author often places an assessment of Anselm into the mouth of his colleagues or even his enemies. When recommending Anselm for the position of archbishop, the bishops tell William Rufus that: 'His (Anselm's) love is set on God alone, his desire, as is evident in all his pursuits, on nothing temporal.'[123] Eadmer repeatedly uses other characters to reinforce this assessment of Anselm's behaviour, and even at the Council of Rockingham, the Bishop of Durham explains to the king that: 'Especially, he (Durham) added, when all his (Anselm's) reasoning rests upon the words of God, and with the authority of St. Peter.'[124] This depiction of Anselm's sole focus on God is a reoccurring theme throughout the *Historia*, and forms a crucial counterpoint to Eadmer's portrait of the King as willing for more power and the bishops as willing personal safety. The centrality of God in this narrative, and the absence of concerns of pragmatism or worldly business copies themes from the *Vita Anselmi*, where Eadmer depicts Anselm as completely disinterested in worldly business (discussed in chapters one and two).

This focus on the righteous as only seeking to carry out God's will becomes integral to a key scene in the *Historia*: Anselm's consecration. Here, Anselm is unable to be persuaded and explicitly refuses to take the position. The bishops resort to physical violence. Anselm is dragged to Rufus' bedside and Eadmer narrates how the bishops prise up his fingers to force the staff into Anselm's hands.[125] The fact Eadmer leaves no possible doubt of Anselm's unwillingness, even detailing the prising of Anselm's fingers, suggests that this use of force is fundamental to the entire case. This scene is partly written to defend Anselm against claims that he had received homage from a schismatic king, for which Anselm was criticised. Anselm's 'consecration by force' absolves him from these later accusations. This theme of reluctance is also recorded in the text of the *Vita Anselmi* when Anselm becomes abbot of Bec. Here, Eadmer explains that Anselm:

---

[123] *HN*, p. 31. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 30: Nil etenim amat praeter Deum; nil, ut in omni studio ejus claret, cupit transitorium…

[124] *HN*, p. 63. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 62: Nil rationis posse afferri ad enervationem rationis Anselmi, praesertim cum omnis, inquit, ratio ejus innitatur verbis Dei, et auctoritate Beati Petri.

[125] Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 35.

> With tears and pitiful sobs he begged and prayed, in the name of Almighty God, that if they had any bowels of mercy in them, they would act towards him with the mercy of God before their eyes, abandoning their attempt and allowing him to remain free of so great a burden… He was constrained by the command which Archbishop Maurilius… had enjoined on his obedience…[126]

In this case, Eadmer does not show Anselm directly refusing the position. The candidate makes excuses and asks his fellow monks for mercy, but this very action implies that Anselm knows he will have to accept the position if they continue to insist. The monks remind him of his love to the 'common good' over self-love, and remembering his duty of obedience to Maurilius, Anselm consents.[127] In this instance, Anselm's acceptance is presented as him willing correctly, and not succumbing to self-love.

The scene in the *Historia* where Anselm is consecrated as archbishop is depicted somewhat differently. Anselm openly and repeatedly tells the bishops that their desire to make him archbishop is not possible.[128] When confronted with the prospect of becoming abbot of Bec, Anselm's hesitation is explained in terms of his natural reluctance to take up 'so great a burden'. In the case in the *Historia*, Anselm explicitly refuses to take the archbishopric.[129] Before Anselm is elected archbishop, Eadmer reports that the bishops of England recommend Anselm as an ideal candidate, remarking that: 'His love is set upon God alone, his desire, as is evident in all his pursuits, on nothing temporal.'[130] William Rufus is unconvinced and retorts: 'No, not even the archbishopric of Canterbury.'[131] In this exchange and the consecration scene that follows, it becomes clear that Eadmer perceives that a 'right

---

[126] *VA*, I, xxvi: orans et obtestans eos per nomen Dei omnipotentis, per si qua in eis erant pietatis viscera, quatenus respectu misericordiae Dei super eum intendant, et ab incepto desistentes se a tanto onere quietum manere permittant… vicit quoque et multo maxime vicit praeceptum, quod, ut supra retulimus, ei fuerat ab archiepiscopo Maurilio per obedientiam injunctum, videlicet, ut si major praelatio quam illius prioratus exstiterat, ipsi aliquando injungeretur, nullatenus eam suscipere recusaret.

[127] *VA*, I, xxvi: utilitate communi.

[128] Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 33.

[129] *VA*, I, xxvi: et ab incepto desistentes se a tanto onere quietum manere permittant…

[130] *HN*, p. 31. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 30: Nil etenim amat praeter Deum; nil, ut in omni studio ejus claret, cupit transitorium.

[131] *HN*, p. 31. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 30: Non, inquit, nec archiepiscopatum Cantuariensem.

will' should be set on God and purely on spiritual pursuits. The implication in Anselm's theology is that right will is unchangeable in its nature, as this will is also God's will. Eadmer cannot show Anselm succumbing to persuasion and taking up the position of archbishop willingly, as this would depict Anselm's will turning and him willing something temporal.[132]

Aside from presenting Anselm as constantly willing God's will or justice, Eadmer's presentation of Anselm's character in the *Historia* appears to reflect Anselmian notions of the nature of God. There are similarities between Anselm's presentation of God and Eadmer's, which also appear in Eadmer's presentation of Anselm himself. In the *Proslogion*, where Anselm is meditating on God's treatment of the wicked, Anselm discusses God's mercy towards evil men:

> For someone who is good both to those who are good and to those who are evil is better than someone who is good only to those who are good. And someone who is good by virtue of both punishing and sparing those who are evil is better than someone who is good by virtue merely of punishing [them]… And so, in this way, it is just that You spare those who are evil and that You make good men from evil ones.[133]

Anselm's theology casts God as merciful and loving, this is highlighted in *Cur Deus homo*, where God's love for mankind is emphasised. Anselm explains that God's love for his creation is so great that he sacrifices his own son to redeem mankind, which has grievously offended him. The theme of God being 'good' towards the wicked is not a particularly common theme in hagiography, which often serve as warnings towards wicked men.

Eadmer uses this vision of a merciful God in the *Historia*. At an early stage in the text, William Rufus complains about the illness which nearly killed him around the time Anselm was consecrated and states to the Bishop of Rochester: 'God will never find me become good

[132] Anselm does not discuss rational creatures 'changing their minds' apart from in his discussion of the fall of the Devil. Anselm, *De casu Diaboli*, 7 & 8.

[133] Anselm, *Proslogion*, 9: Melior enim est qui et bonis et malis bonus est, quam qui bonis tantum est bonus; et melior est, qui malis et puniendo et parcendo est bonus, quam qui puniendo tantum… Hoc itaque modo justum est ut parcas malis, et ut facias bonos de malis.

in return for the evil he has done to me.'[134] After William Rufus' death, Eadmer recalls this moment in his account, and elaborates:

> I reflect too how afterwards God dealt with him so long as he lived. It is common knowledge that from the time he uttered those worlds, after he had recovered from the sickness by which, as is well known, he had been laid low, he had such success in overcoming and conquering his enemies, in acquiring territories, in giving free play to his desires, that you would suppose that all the world was smiling upon him… It was as if God was saying in answer to these words, 'If, as you say, I shall never find you become good in return for evil, I will try whether instead I can find you become good in return for good… So, since he refused either to be disciplined by ill-fortune or to be led to right-doing by good fortune, to prevent his raging to fury long continued to the detriment of all good men, the just Judge by a death sharp and swift cut short his life in this world.[135]

This section appears to be influenced by ideas which are also expressed in the *Proslogion* and in other texts written by Anselm; God attempts to redeem William, both by punishing him and then by sparing him. It is significant that Eadmer's narrative essentially suggests that even God is unable to reform William Rufus. Eadmer's statement that the king would not be: 'disciplined by ill-fortune or to be led by right-doing by good fortune'. The suggestion behind this account is that if the king's behaviour would not be corrected by God, that it would be unreasonable to expect Anselm to achieve this.

The theme of God returning good for evil is mirrored in Anselm's own behaviour as at the Pope's court, where Anselm is shown to beg the pope not to excommunicate William Rufus, causing the audience to greatly admire him: 'seeing him (Anselm) return good for

---

[134] *HN*, p. 40. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 39: nunquam me Deus bonum habebit pro malo quod mihi intulerit.

[135] *HN*, p. 121. Eadmer, *Historia*, pp. 116-117: perpendo quid postmodum Deus erga illum egerit, donec vitae praesenti superfuit. Scitur enim quia ex quo illa verba, depulso languore, quo notum est illum fuisse gravatum, protulit, tantum in deprimendo et subjugando inimicos, in acquirendo terras, in exercendo voluptates suas prosperatus est, ut omnia sibi arridere putares… Quapropter dum nec malo corrigi voluit, nec bono ad bene agendum attrahi potuit, ne in perniciem bonorum diutino furore saeviret, compendiosa illum et momentanea caede aequus Arbiter huic vitae subtraxit.

evil'.[136] This parallel between God's treatment of William Rufus and Anselm's presents Anselm as adopting the same attitude as God in the archbishop's rather gentle treatment of the unruly king. This example of Anselm attempting to use good to redeem sinners is a parallel of Anselm's own stance on disciplining his monks, which is discussed at length in chapter two of this thesis. The use of good to redeem sinners, as practised by both Anselm and by Anselm's God, does not appear to be a theory wide-spread in contemporary texts or practises.

Eadmer's juxtaposition of Anselm against William Rufus often highlights Anselm's comparative weakness or feebleness. In Anselm's prophecy after the consecration where William Rufus is cast as an angry bull (discussed earlier in relation to Augustinian themes), Eadmer uses the opportunity to characterise Anselm differently:

> You are trying to harness together at the plough under one yoke an untamed bull and an old and feeble sheep… you have heedlessly joined together the King's fury and my weakness.[137]

Eadmer uses these metaphors to identify the ruling character traits of his leading protagonists: Rufus is powerful and angry and Anselm is feeble and mild. Anger is not necessarily a negative trait in the Canterbury hagiographical tradition. Many of the most captivating moments from the Canterbury *Vitae* established a convention of powerful archbishops who channel righteous anger against the wicked. Examples such as Dunstan dragging his king from the midst of his ménage a trois or Oda branding the face of the adulterous woman show traditional Canterbury figures acting in ways which suggest an entirely different approach to Anselm's rather milder approach.[138]

The excerpt cited above regarding the piety of Robert Curthose suggests that Eadmer believed power amongst the laity was often wielded through impious means, as pious men easily lost the support of those who were easily swayed by threats or bribes.[139] Anselm's weakness may partly be derived from his lack of anger: if William Rufus' temporal power flows

---

[136] *HN*, p. 111. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 107: dum illum et pro malo bonum reddere.

[137] *HN,* p. 37. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 36: Indomitum taurum, et vetulam ac debilem ovem in aratro conjungere… nisi vobis qui tam inconsiderate regis feritatem et meam imbecillitatem conjunxistis.

[138] *VOO*, p. 28. *VD*, p. 98.

[139] Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 165.

from his anger and willingness to sin, then Anselm's comparative weakness flows from his lack of anger and lack of sin.

The individuals who are characterised as angry in the *Historia* tend to be laymen – William I, William II and Henry I all display anger, as well as the bishops who oppose Anselm in the disputes with William II. By comparison, Lanfranc and Anselm seem to remain composed, even in circumstances where it might be expected for an ecclesiastic to become angry.[140] Discussion on anger or wrath in Anselm's theology is infrequent and a little conflicting. In *Cur Deus homo*, Anselm identifies that no human should take vengeance on another, as this right belong to God, but then complicates this by adding that sometimes, God appoints humans as his instruments. However, those who act as instruments of God are not necessarily pious men.[141] The topic of anger does appear in *De concordia*, where Anselm states that anger is an appetite to which humans are subject as a result of original sin, and explains that humans were created in a state where they could not experience wrath.[142] William Rufus' anger, therefore, must be significant as a sign of his failure to act correctly as a rational being – in succumbing to anger, the king surrenders to his basic appetites. Eadmer's text, which deals with anger in a far more comprehensive manner than Anselm ever does, may give insight into some of Anselm's private discussion, and of Eadmer's interpretation of this discussion.

Books Three & Four

The style of the *Historia* changes as the work enters the reign of Henry I. Eadmer does occasionally reproduce the language and themes used in relation to William Rufus, depicting Henry I as seeking supreme power in the kingdom in the same style as William Rufus. However, this is not consistent and at other points, Eadmer praises Henry I's conduct, especially when the king appears to be defending Canterbury's primacy. For instance, after explaining that Henry I had listened to the advice of his bishops, expressing a fear of being excommunicated by Anselm, Eadmer then immediately writes: 'Then and for long afterwards

[140] When compared to the behaviour of other Canterbury ecclesiastics such as Oda or Dunstan.

[141] Anselm, *De concordia*, 1, 12.

[142] Anselm, *De concordia*, 7.

the king was praised as a quite outstanding prince'.[143] Eadmer does occasionally even blame Henry I's failings on the dead William I and William Rufus, as Henry I justifies his behaviour as keeping to: 'the usages of my predecessors'.[144] But at other times in the text, when Henry I refuses to listen to Anselm's guidance, Eadmer duplicates themes from William Rufus' reign, showing Henry I as seeking supremacy of will in his kingdom. So, Eadmer reports Henry I as stating:

> I am not discussing the letters, nor will I do so; but whether or not he is willing to fall in with my wishes in all respects and that without any sort of evasion, let me hear him say that.[145]

Further examples of Henry I's later threats of removing Anselm's limbs or of forcing Anselm into exile when he refuses to comply, the king's accusations that Anselm is removing what belongs to the king and Eadmer's description of Henry I's victory in Normandy as involving the bribery of the Norman chiefs may be a continuation of the themes from the account of William Rufus.[146] In general, Eadmer represents Henry I as a superior king to William Rufus, sometimes willing to listen to Anselm's advice, but at other times showing the usual flaws of secular lords and sinking back into sinful behaviour. Henry I may have lacked the literary potential of William Rufus; Henry I is neither a foil in the way of William Rufus nor a model lord like Robert Curthose and does not fit easily into the dichotomous style of the first books of the *Historia*. Further to this, at the time of writing, Henry I was still living, and Eadmer may have considered this fact when he composed the later books.

Eadmer's use of Anselmian themes in the *Historia* takes a different form to his approach in the *Vita Anselmi*. In the *Historia*, Eadmer explores ideas such as the secular world, time, fallen man and sin, and presents these topics in deeply theological terms. Although Eadmer was present at some of the scenes he described, his recording is undoubtedly an interpretation of actual events. In this text, Eadmer particularly transformed the political

---

[143] *HN*, p. 224. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 209: Deinde in laudibus eximii principis demoratum est.

[144] *HN*, p. 138. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 131: usus antecessorum meorum.

[145] *HN*, p. 145. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 137: Nequaquam de litteris ago vel agam; sed an meae voluntati, omni ambage dimissa, in cunctis concurrere velit, edicat ut audiam.

[146] Eadmer, *Historia*, pp. 146, 152, 165.

conflict between Anselm and William Rufus into a war between the heavenly and the earthly: between the City of God and the City of Man. Eadmer's 'pantomime villain', the furious William Rufus who speaks in theological language only ever to condemn himself, may be far more than a theatrical caricature.[147] Saint Anselm's struggle against a monster of impiety is described through the lens of Anselmian theology, where the king and his bishops speak and act in ways which deepen Eadmer's theological narrative. Eadmer may have distorted the real character of William Rufus, but by doing this, Eadmer was able to apply an Anselmian reading and represent both the City of God, and the City of Man.

[147] E. Mason, 'William Rufus: myth and reality', *Journal of Medieval History* 3:1 (1977), pp. 1-20, at p. 18.

Chapter 4: Osbern of Canterbury's hagiographical writing

The works of Osbern of Canterbury, Eadmer's near-contemporary, provide a contrast to the way in which Eadmer incorporated elements from Anselmian thought into his works of history and hagiography. Osbern, also a monk of Christ Church, Canterbury, was active in the period directly before Eadmer was writing. The extent to which Osbern used Anselm as a model to construct the behaviour of his subjects and included ideas from Anselm's theological writings in his hagiographical texts is an intriguing question. Osbern's integration of these themes into his works of hagiography is distinct from Eadmer's approach, yet both authors draw on the same source material and deploy the same authorial strategy which operates at least in part through the inclusion of themes from the writings and life of a contemporary thinker, in this case Anselm.

Osbern's hagiographical corpus consists of two works, the *Vita Dunstani* and the *Vita Alfege*, both written in the post conquest period. Osbern had entered the Christ Church community as a monk and later became precentor; he composed the *Vita Alfege* around c.1080.[1] The *Vita Dunstani* is believed to have been written at a later point; Jay Rubenstein has convincingly argued for a date during the vacancy period after Lanfranc's death (1089-1093).[2] In Osbern's texts, it is possible to identify two distinct ways in which the author makes use of Anselmian examples, one being Anselm's real life behaviour and the second his theological vision. In the case of Osbern, the extent to which he was familiar with Anselm's written corpus will be discussed below. However, it is important to note that at the point of Osbern's first acquaintance with Anselm, many of Anselm's works were in the process of formation; as time passed they would have been available, potentially, to Osbern in their final written form. The circumstances of Osbern's familiarity with Anselm mean that these two modes generally derive from the same source: Anselm's life and conversation. So, for

[1] The role of precantors and cantors is explored in: C. C. Rozier, 'Symeon of Durham as Cantor and Historian at Durham Cathedral Priory, c.1090-1129' in *Medieval Cantors and their Craft: Music, Liturgy and the Shaping of History* eds. K. A. Bugyis, A. Kraebel and M. E. Fassler (York: York Medieval Press, 2016) pp. 190-206.

[2] J. Rubenstein, 'The life and writings of Osbern of Canterbury', in *Canterbury and the Norman Conquest: Churches, Saints and Scholars, 1066-1109,* eds. R Eales & R. Sharpe (London: The Hambledon Press, 1995), pp. 27-40, at pp. 28-30.

example, especially in the case of the *Vita Alfege*, Osbern appears to use Anselm's behaviour to model aspects of hagiographical subjects. In addition, theological themes emerge from both the *Vita Alfege* and *Vita Dunstani* which can be traced to Anselm's theological oeuvre. Osbern's use of Anselmian themes offers substantial grounds for comparison with Eadmer's use of similar material. Osbern's incorporation of these themes are distinct from Eadmer's own use, which suggests a range of approaches to incorporating contemporary material, likely reflecting authorial preference.

Osbern is known to have spent some time at Bec monastery in the 1070s, which indicates he had an opportunity to become familiar with both the figure of Anselm as a monastic leader and with his extant writings, for example, many of the prayers and meditations, the *Monologion* and *Proslogion* and the first versions of the treatises associated with *De veritate*. After a period of dissent at Canterbury, Osbern had been sent by Lanfranc to Bec for reformation, and then for several years lived at the monastery under Anselm's supervision.[3] The precise dating of the period is unclear, but appears to be between 1073-79; Southern suggested Osbern may have made a two year stay between 1073-76.[4] This suggested period is directly consonant with the writing of Anselm's first theological works. It seems reasonable to posit that Anselm may have been discussing ideas which would appear in later works.[5] After returning to Canterbury, Osbern began to write works of hagiography commemorating the cults of Canterbury saints, which incorporated Anselmian themes. There is evidence, discussed below, that during Osbern's stay at Bec, Osbern and Anselm developed a personal relationship, which indicates that these themes may be directly related to Anselm's influence. Osbern's two surviving works, the *Vita Alfege* and *Vita Dunstani*, both contain theological ideas which parallel Anselm's writing. In particular, Osbern's writing often echoes ideas from the three treatises, *De veritate, De libertate arbitrii* and *De casu diaboli.* Notions in these three treatises may have been of particular interest to Osbern, as they address questions of free will, truth, evil and humanity in the world. Presenting these ideas coherently within a narrative framework would have been a fundamental part of creating a work of

[3] Southern, *Portrait*, pp. 313-316.

[4] Southern, *Portrait*, pp. 248-253.

[5] This is probably because of the Monologion *Preface*, where Anselm explains that the treatise was born out of discussion with fellow monks.

human history; the ideas in these particular treatises may have been a topic of discussion between Anselm and Osbern.

There is a considerable amount of evidence recording Osbern's residence at Bec; letters exchanged between Anselm and Lanfranc directly discuss Osbern, although Osbern himself never refers to his Bec stay in his own work. In a letter sent from Anselm to Lanfranc, dated at a point between 1073-7, Anselm refers to one 'Dom Osbern', identifying him as a monk sent by Lanfranc to Bec. Anselm comments on this monk's religious and intellectual development whilst at Bec, directly praising Osbern's 'perseverance in study, coolness of thinking' and his 'tenacious memory', specific details which suggest that Anselm probably mentored Osbern personally.[6] Anselm then forecasts the emotional pain he will undergo when Osbern is recalled to Canterbury, giving details of an illness from which Osbern was suffering. The extent to which Anselm seems familiar with Osbern's health suggests that they had developed a personal relationship during this period. Immediately after digressing on the nature of Osbern's illness, Anselm requests copies of Canterbury manuscripts associated with Dunstan, an epistolary arrangement that might suggest that Anselm had been informed of the existence of these manuscripts by Osbern himself. A second letter, this time sent by Anselm to Prior Henry of Canterbury, may have been brought by Osbern on his return to Canterbury. Anselm explains that Osbern is now a reformed character, writing:

> My beloved, your Dom Osbern, who is being brought to you, so freely accuses and curses the perversity of his former life… is so inflamed by love of a praiseworthy life that his inner man may be thought, not without cause, either to have changed for the better already or surely to be about to change easily.[7]

[6] Anselm, *Ep.* 39: Et scientiae profectu per studii instantiam et ingenii serenitatem tenacemque memoriam quotidie laudabiliter crescit. Anselm's interest in Osbern's health problems are the subject a study by Giles Gasper - 'A doctor in the house'? The context for Anselm of Canterbury's interest in medicine with reference to a probable case of malaria', *Journal of Medieval History* 30 (2004), pp. 245-261.

[7] Anselm, *Ep.* 67: Dilectus meus domnus Osbernus vester, qui ad vos redit, sic pristinae vitae perversitatem sponte accusat et exsecratur; atque, inquantum ex ea quam nobiscum habuit conversatione palam et secrete experiri potui, sic vitae laudabilis amore accenditur, ut non immerito interior homo ejus in melius aut jam mutatus, aut procul dubio facile mutandus existimetur.

Anselm goes on to refer to his and Osbern's unified souls, further suggesting that these two men had developed a personal connection as either friends or as student and mentor. In addition, there are further letters sent to Canterbury after Osbern's return.[8] Osbern also sent letters to Anselm: two letters urging him to accept the archbishopric.[9] The evidence from Anselm's letter collection suggests that Anselm and Osbern developed both an intellectual and a personal bond. It is reasonable to imagine that Anselm had focussed his attentions on Osbern as Lanfranc had directly requested.

As a sinner needing correction, Osbern would have been exposed to Anselm's interpretation of monastic discipline at Bec, which might have provided the inspiration for Osbern's inclusion of Anselmian themes of discretion in his hagiographical texts. As discussed in chapter one, Anselm's approach to monastic discipline was distinct from other contemporary figures of authority, taking a gentler and more encouraging form of correction. For instance, Anselm was completely opposed to the use of corporal punishment when disciplining the young.[10] Anselm's insistence that Osbern was reformed at Bec implies that he responded to Anselm's methods, and may have been convinced of the merits of Anselm-style discipline.

In addition to experiencing Anselm's discipline first hand, Osbern also may have been exposed to Anselm's intellectual ideas during conversation in the monastery. Anselm mentions that many of his texts originated as topics of discussion with fellow monks. In the preface to the *Monologion*, Anselm opens with the statement: 'Some of my brethren have often and earnestly asked me to write down, as a kind of model meditation, some of the things I have said…[11]' In other texts, Anselm again hints at this method of formulation. In a letter to Maurice, which included a copy of *De casu diaboli*, Anselm explains: 'Moreover, at the request of certain brothers repeatedly begging me to do so – as you know – I recently

[8] Anselm, *Ep.* 74.

[9] Anselm, *Epp.* 149, 152.

[10] Anselm, *Ep.* 140. In this letter, Anselm intercedes with Prior Henry for a young monk named Moses and his companion who had deserted the community of Christ Church. Anselm begs the prior not to beat the returning monk.

[11] Anselm, *Monologion*, Preface: Quidam fratres saepe me studioseque precati sunt ut quaedam quae illis de meditanda Divinitatis essential.

completed that treatise which deals with…'[12] Anselm's use of dialogue form for a number of treatises, including the *De veritate* group, as well as a pre-disposition to dialogue as a compositional mode, implies an origin in discussion. In several of the prefaces to his works, Anselm complains about others copying out his works before he has finished to his satisfaction.[13] This implies that Anselm composed his work in a fairly informal manner and that a group of monks had access to his ideas before the treatises reached their final forms. Further evidence for this style of composition exists in the *Vita Anselmi*, where Eadmer notes Anselm's habit of engaging in edifying conversation during mealtimes; he may have used the more intellectual monks at Bec to help develop his ideas.[14] Osbern, whom Anselm identified as particularly outstanding in study, may have been part of this cohort. If this was the case, Osbern would have been exposed to a wide range of spiritual and speculative discussion.

Aside from his familiarity with Anselm, Osbern personally knew Eadmer; one of their conversations was recalled by Eadmer in his tract on the relics of St. Audoen.[15] There is also a close association between Osbern and Eadmer's texts; Eadmer used Osbern's hagiographical texts as source-texts.[16] Significantly, Eadmer's vivid description of Anselm's consecration in the *Historia* appears to be based on Osbern's own depiction of the scene in one of the letters that Osbern wrote to Anselm in the aftermath of the actual event.[17] As a second Canterbury monk who personally knew both Anselm and Eadmer, Osbern presents an interesting point of comparison with Eadmer's own exposition of Anselm's teachings.

Anselm as *exemplum* in Osbern's texts

The *Vita Alfege*, Osbern's first hagiographical work, incorporates a great number of Anselmian themes. This work has been dated to c.1080, composed after Anselm's first visit to

[12] Anselm, *Ep.* 97: Praeterea scriptum illud, quod de ea quaestione, quomodo scilicet, cum malum nihil esse dicatur, nomen ejus aliquid significet, rogatu quorumdam fratrum de talibus me frequenter.

[13] Anselm, *Monologion*, Preface. Anselm, *Proslogion*, Preface.

[14] *VA*, II, xi.

[15] Eadmer, 'De reliquiis S. Audoeni', ed. A. Wilmart, *Revue des sciences religieuses* 15 (1935), pp. 302-70 at p. 367.

[16] Eadmer's *Vita Odonis, Vita Dunstani* and *Vita Oswaldi*'s all use Osbern's *Vita Dunstani* as a source.

[17] Anselm, *Ep.* 149. Eadmer, *Historia*, pp. 34-36.

Canterbury in 1079.[18] In the *Vita Anselmi*, Eadmer records a discussion that occurred during this visit regarding the questioned sanctity of Alfege.[19] According to Eadmer, Archbishop Lanfranc felt unconvinced that Alfege, English saint and sometime archbishop of Canterbury, warranted such status. The claim to Alfege's sanctity rested on the nature of his death. After having been captured by the Vikings, Alfege had refused to allow the people of Canterbury to pay the ransom demanded by his captors. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle records the Vikings' subsequent murder of Alfege, reporting that he was beaten to death with axes and the bones of cattle.[20] Lanfranc was not, apparently, persuaded that this death was that of a Christian martyr; this uncertainty Eadmer attributes to Lanfranc's unfamiliarity with the customs of his new country. The debate, which is recorded in detail, has Anselm arguing strongly for the sanctity of Alfege, and eventually persuading a sceptical Lanfranc that Alfege was a true martyr. Anselm's defence of Alfege rested on the point that Alfege died 'for justice' and as the archbishop could not sin in this small matter it could be assumed therefore that he would not sin in the serious crime of denying Christ. Southern, amongst others, saw this discussion as part of the widespread uncertainty of the newly-arrived Normans at Canterbury as to the appropriate place of Anglo-Saxon saints, and the subsequent acceptance or rejection of these figures.[21] In this particular case, with Lanfranc persuaded of the sanctity of Alfege, Osbern began the composition of a work of hagiography.

In the preface to the *Vita Alfege*, Osbern states that the information he used to compose the life was recorded either from eye-witnesses or from those who had heard the events from eye-witnesses (Alfege, it should be noted, died in 1012).[22] Nevertheless, as the work contains omissions about the progression of Alfege's career and other accounts of

[18] *Vita Alfege*, p. 10.

[19] *VA*, I, xxx.

[20] *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: a Collaborative Edition*, vol. 7. MS E, ed. S. Irvine (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2002), p. 142.

[21] Southern, *Portrait*, pp. 313-316. J. Rubenstein, 'Liturgy against History: The Competing visions of Lanfranc and Eadmer of Canterbury, *Speculum* 74:2 (1999), pp. 279-309. S. *Ridyard*, 'Condigna veneratio: post-Conquest attitudes to the saints of the Anglo-Saxons', *ANS* 9 (1987), pp. 179–206, at pp. 200-203.

[22] Osbern, *VA*, p. 122. This thesis uses Wharton's *Anglia sacra* as the critical edition for the *Vita Alfege*, although the work is also included in *Patrologia Latina*. This choice is partially owing to Francis Shaw's preference for Wharton; this thesis employs Shaw's translation.

Alfege's life are brief and undetailed, Frances Shaw, the translator of *the Vita Alfege*, has argued that Osbern is likely to have created the narrative of the work himself.[23] Osbern's lack of available textual material may have prompted the construction of both the character of Alfege and the events described in the life, given the lack of an existing *Vita* to interpolate and minimal surviving records of Alfege's actual life. It is possible, therefore, Osbern may have derived the *Vita Alfege* from standard hagiographical *topoi* and from his own life-experiences. Given that Osbern had just undergone an apparently successful reformation at Bec, it might be argued that Anselm provided a natural figure or model for Osbern to use in his work.

A close reading of Osbern's hagiographical works identifies areas where contemporary Anselmian themes have been incorporated into historic characters and events. It has been established that Osbern was at least a close acquaintance of Anselm himself and was probably familiar with his theological ideas. In order to determine examples of Anselm's behaviour that might have been adopted by Osbern as worthy of emulation, this chapter will use evidence taken from Anselm's letters or works if possible, on occasions where Osbern seems to be drawing from real life. It will be necessary also to have recourse to Eadmer's *Vita Anselmi* given that Anselm left no similar, or detailed, written account of his own behaviour as abbot or archbishop.

This particularly applies to the character of Alfege in the *Vita Alfege*. Anselm's writing, specifically his letter collection, when taken alongside Eadmer's presentation of his master's life in the *Vita Anselmi*, provides a basis for our understanding of Anselm's behaviour. This can be compared with Osbern's presentation of the character of Alfege in the *Vita Alfege*. There are a number of areas where the influence of Anselm's teachings in the *Vita Alfege* are apparent, both in specific behaviours and in background events. The later *Vita Dunstani*, which is based on literary sources present at Canterbury, does not use Anselm as a basis for the character of Dunstan as it is likely that Dunstan's character was too well established when this work of hagiography was written for Osbern to feel significant changes were either possible or appropriate.[24] However, Osbern incorporates ideas from Anselm's theological writings into both the *Vita Alfege* and *Vita Dunstani*, in particular from the three treatises

[23] *Vita Alfege*, pp. 22-23.

[24] Rubenstein, 'The life and writings of Osbern of Canterbury', p. 38.

associated with *De veritate*. Where the *Vita Alfege* incorporates notions from Anselm's theology across the entire text of this saint's life, the *Vita Dunstani*'s use of Anselm's thought is more piecemeal, often appearing attached to episodes Osbern is copying from existing texts. Osbern takes different approaches to the inclusion of Anselmian thought in these two texts, which may reflect both the two distinct times of writing and the respective status' of the saints' cults.

Osbern's use of Anselmian themes is significant to this thesis as it presents a point of comparison with Eadmer's hagiographical writing, explored in chapter one. Although Rubenstein suggests that these shared themes could have been formulated through collaboration between Eadmer and Osbern, this seems unlikely.[25] When Osbern wrote the *Vita Alfege*, Eadmer would have been in his late teens or just entering his twenties, and not yet an active author. In addition, there is little evidence that Eadmer and Anselm were acquainted at this early stage. Eadmer, when he was about nineteen, had met Anselm during his visit to the Canterbury community. In the *Vita Anselmi*, Eadmer remembers the occasion vividly, describing Anselm's conversation and stating that he, Eadmer, had come 'to the notice' [*notitiam*] of Anselm.[26] There is no suggestion, however, that Anselm identified Eadmer as a particularly promising student or that they shared a deeper intellectual exchange than Anselm might have with any other young monk. Anselm does not mention Eadmer in his letters to Canterbury in the future and does not ask after his studies – had Anselm been particularly impressed with Eadmer, Anselm may well have sent works or words of encouragement.[27] This exchange may rather be one star-struck young monk amongst many, meeting a much respected and admired abbot. Given that Eadmer's pre-1093 work appears to lack Anselmian themes, the connection between Eadmer and Anselm perhaps should be moved from this first meeting to a later date, perhaps just before 1093, when they met once again. The idea that Osbern was in any way influenced by Eadmer can be eliminated and instead the contrary idea that Eadmer may have been influenced by Osbern or Osbern's work

[25] Ibid.

[26] *VA*, I, xxix.

[27] Eadmer's name is absent from six names Anselm sends his regards to in a letter to Maurice in 1076. Osbern is named, but Eadmer is not. Anselm, *Ep.* 74.

should be advanced. Osbern's incorporation of Anselmian themes into his hagiographical works may anticipate Eadmer's later writing.

In the *Vita Alfege*, Osbern used Anselm as a model for the hagiographical subject. Comparisons between the characters of Anselm and Alfege cannot be made consistently throughout the two texts of the *Vita Anselmi* and the *Vita Alfege*, and instead can be observed specifically where the subjects' behaviour as leaders and role-models to their communities is discussed. All the chapters of the *Vita Alfege* which are dedicated to describing Alfege's rule as abbot and Alfege's habits bear distinct similarities to certain episodes from the *Vita Anselmi*.[28] These parallels differ markedly in their form and degree of resemblance and in this context, it can be argued that more unusual similarities may add more weight to comparisons which could be coincidental. To explore these instances, this chapter will look first at parallels in terms of Anselm and Alfege's characters and teachings, then at comparable events and third, contextual oddities in the *Vita Alfege* which may have been influenced by Anselm.

One recurring theme in the *Vita Alfege* which appears to be influenced by Anselm is related to discretion and the correct application of discipline. Chapter nine of the *Vita Alfege* details Alfege's character. The main theme of this chapter is Alfege's ability to adapt to the ways of people around him, then continues to a discussion of Alfege's fasting and sleeping habits. Here, Osbern establishes Alfege's use of discretion, explaining that: 'Alfege adapted himself to the ways of everyone, so that he was dear to everyone and no-one envied his glory…'[29] In chapter ten of the *Vita Alfege*, this theme emerges for a second time, as Osbern again mentions Alfege's ability to adapt his speech and mind to 'every kind of person'.[30] The subject of Anselm's discretion is a major theme throughout the *Vita Anselmi*, and is comparable to Alfege's use of discretion, both are both less severe and more flexible in form. Examples of Anselm adapting himself to the behaviour of individuals occurs throughout the *Vita Anselmi*, being most explicit in chapters which address Anselm's attitude towards sinners or describe Anselm's preaching.[31] Anselm's use of discretion is unusual because of its milder form and this becomes particularly clear in the sphere of discipline. In the *Vita Anselmi*,

[28] These chapters are 1, 3, 4, 9, 10 and 14. Osbern, *VA*, p. 123-5, 127-8, 130-1.

[29] *Vita Alfege*, p. 41. Osbern, *VA*, p. 127: At Elphegus ita se omnium moribus condonavit.

[30] *Vita Alfege*, p. 42. Osbern, *VA*, p. 127: Omni etenim generi hominum.

[31] *VA*, I, x-xi, xxii, xxviii.

Anselm is recorded rebuking a fellow abbot at length for this abbot's harsh treatment of his poorly-behaved oblates; there is also an extended description of Anselm's reformation of a Bec monk who was particularly disobedient.[32]

The expectation that abbots should adapt their behaviour to others is a fairly common *topos* in hagiographical writing; chapter two of the Rule of St. Benedict encourages abbots to 'vary their approach according to the situation'. This use of discretion might be expected, but as discussed in chapter two, the Rule generally instructs that those who are 'proud and disobedient' should be pushed more harshly than the 'obedient, mild and patient', who ought to be encouraged.[33] The case of Anselm's treatment of a rebellious monk called Osbern (a different monk to Osbern the hagiographer) as recorded by Eadmer, also discussed in chapter two, shows Anselm's alternative interpretation of discipline.[34] This conviction that weaker or sinful individuals should be treated more gently than their obedient fellows is repeated both in Anselm's letters and in other areas in the *Vita Anselmi* (for a full discussion, see chapter two).[35]

This view on discipline also appears in the *Vita Alfege*. In chapter fourteen of the *Vita Alfege*, Osbern narrates Alfege's return to Britain and his conduct of services. Here, Osbern records Alfege's use of discretion in the treatment of sinners, explaining of the subject:

[32] *VA*, I, x, xxii.

[33] St. Benedict, *Benedict's Rule*, ed. and trans. T. G. Kardong (Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1996), RB II: Id est, miscens temporibus tempora, terroribus blandimenta, dirum magistri, pium patris ostendat affectum, id est indisciplinatos et inquietos debet durius arguere, oboedientes autem et mites et patientes, ut in melius proficiant obsecrare, neglegentes et contemnentes ut increpat et corripiat admonemus… Et honestiores quidem atque intelligibiles animos prima vel secunda admonition verbis corripat, improbos autem et duros ac superbos vel inoboedientes verberum vel corporis castigatio in ipso initio peccati coerceat.

[34] *VA*, I, x. For more discussion on Anselmian discipline, see particularly chapter two.

[35] *VA*, I, xxii. Anselm, *Ep.* 140.

> If he could not turn sinners to God through his words, then he did so by acts of kindness. He neglected nothing that was in their interest, until those whom his words of admonition would not correct were won over by the generosity of his kindness.[36]

Alfege's attitude appears to soften with the degree of resistance to reformation, in a mirror of Anselm's own. This method of using kindness and generosity to turn sinners back to God, instead of harsher styles of discipline perhaps involving violence or physical punishment does not seem to have been drawn from any Canterbury source and instead may reflect Osbern's recent experiences at Bec.

As demonstrated in chapter one, some existing cults of Canterbury saints tended to favour harsher styles of discipline. Anselm's attitude of sympathy and gentleness towards sinners is not apparent in the *Vitae* of traditional Canterbury figures such as Dunstan, and other Canterbury saints appear firm and uncompromising in their treatment of sinners, sometimes taking violent action against the wicked. One example of this is in the life of Archbishop Oda, who, as mentioned in chapter one, is recorded as personally branding the face of a female adulterer before exiling her to Ireland.[37] Anselm's disagreement with his fellow abbot in the *Vita Anselmi* demonstrates that Anselm's view was not necessarily an attitude typical even in his own circles. This is a case where two independent figures are recorded as advocating an alternative disciplinary style. The likelihood of Osbern using Anselm as a model on which to build an original, contemporary and outstanding monastic character seems probable when this shared alternative interpretation of the Rule is taken into account.

Aside from these similarities in Alfege and Anselm's teachings and behaviour, there are also unusual resemblances in the descriptions of certain events and details in these two texts. The most intriguing similarity is related to the events describing the scandalous behaviour of Alfege's community. In a chapter in the *Vita Alfege*, Alfege's community rebel against him, engage in gluttony and other sinful behaviour, before a monk dies and Alfege has

---

[36] *Vita Alfege*, pp. 48-9. Osbern, *VA*, p. 130: Peccantes, ut ad Dominum converterentur, si verbis non posset, beneficiis provocabat; nil quod sua interesset negligens: Dum quos admonition verbi non corrigeret, liberalitas beneficii superaret.

[37] *VOO*, p. 28.

a vision of demons punishing the dead monk. The consequence of the monk's death is the reconciliation of the community to their abbot. This basic story bears some resemblance to events from Eadmer's chapter nine and ten of the *Vita Anselmi*.[38] Eadmer explains that, as a prior, Anselm encountered dissent from those jealous of his promotion, which he faced in his typical fashion by acting piously and being sympathetic to the sinful monks. Eadmer continues with the example of Anselm's treatment of the Bec monk Osbern, and describes how Anselm reformed the young man before he died. After the young monk's death, Anselm had a vision of 'persons of venerable appearance' who sat in judgement around the dead man, before the young monk Osbern appeared.[39] Although the details of the two narratives differ in many aspects, the basic outline is identical in both cases: certain members of the community rebelled, a monk died, there was a supernatural appearance and after the man's death, the abbot in question won the loyalty of the rebellious community.

In the *Vita Anselmi* Eadmer puts the story to a different narrative purpose, and his dying monk is reformed at Anselm's hands and escapes punishment, whereas Osbern's rebellious monk is an unrepentant sinner punished by God, but the events in each text mirror each other. These two examples also have similar concluding comments. In the *Vita Alfege*, Osbern ends by stating that:

> Thus God in his goodness, because of a man's finest merits, would not let one man's crime lie hidden, but wanted to uncover the evils of all; he would not spare one man but wanted to heal the ills of all.[40]

This extract suggests that the case of the rebellious monk was an impetus for the reformation of the entire community. Osbern suggests that God essentially used the singular incident to correct a number of monks. In the *Vita Anselmi* Eadmer describes the young monk Osbern's death, then explains that many monks were inspired by Anselm's treatment of Osbern to devote themselves to their abbot; there is no more mention of trouble in the community. Eadmer finishes by commenting:

---

[38] *VA*, I, ix-x.

[39] *VA*, I, x: Reverendi vultus personas.

[40] *Vita Alfege*, p. 36. Osbern, *VA*, p. 125: Sic pius Deus propter optima viri merita, dum unius scelus noluit latere, omnium mala voluit detegere: Et dum uni noluit parcere, omnium morbos voluit sanare.

> From this time therefore several of them devoted themselves body and mind to Anselm's service, hoping to succeed to Osbern's place in his affections, but he, though he thanked God for their change of heart, 'became all things to all men, that [he] might save all'.[41]

The two authors' ending lines, where they both move from the specific case of the dead monk to the general reformation of further individuals within the community is again, not identical, but suggests that the incident shares an identical 'moral', where an 'actor' used a single sinner to reform an entire community. In each text, the primary 'actor' is described in a slightly different fashion: Osbern's is God and Eadmer's is God working through a human (in this case Anselm), however both cases show God acting within a monastic community. The similarities between these two accounts and the identical moral message, regardless of differing details may suggest that both accounts share a common source.

The story of Osbern (the rebellious Bec monk) forms an extended chapter in the *Vita Anselmi*. Considering the detail that Eadmer recounts this episode in and the appearance of a similar narrative in the *Vita Alfege*, this account may have become a feature of Bec monastery's recent history. The knowledge of both of these authors of the same set of events may reflect the circulation of this story within Anselm's circle. The parallels between these two texts suggests that the narrative in the *Vita Alfege* reflects a contemporary event Anselm may have told Osbern as part of a general didactic lesson. Eadmer's account gives details of a Bec rebellion, probably also recounted to Eadmer by Anselm himself. The similarities may be due to the two accounts being inspired by one real event which took place at Bec, which Anselm may have told to the two authors on two separate occasions. Anselm's purpose in relating stories to his students was not, presumably, to relay a historic record of his rule, but rather was primarily educational. Therefore, when Anselm told the two authors about the Bec rebellion, he may have told them slightly different stories depending on the context at the time of narration. Anselm may have perhaps even combined separate events together, to form a coherent narrative with an overarching message. These two authors would then have

[41] *VA*, I, x: Ex hoc ergo singuli quique corpore et animo se subdunt Anselmo, cupientes in anicitiam eius haereditario iure succedere Osberno. At ille in conversione ipsorum Deo gratias agens omnibus omnia factus est, ut omnes faceret salvos. The quotation in this excerpt is from Corinthians ix:22.

put this lecture to their own narrative purpose, creating further distortions between the account as explained in both texts. The differences in the details, which can be mapped onto a general story may reflect both Anselm's probable adaption of his lectures to his audience as well as these authors' own alterations of specific details to fit with their overall narratives. The combination of the similar basic storyline, complete with the quite distinctive comment where the author relates the reformation of a single to the reformation of an entire community is likely to reflect some similar origin. As Osbern the Bec monk's death has been dated to around 1071, Osbern of Canterbury would have been resident at Bec directly after the events described in the *Vita Anselmi*, and this episode, therefore, could, chronologically at least, have influenced or inspired the chapter in the *Vita Alfege*.[42]

Osbern's narration of Alfege's attitude towards his own studies and to the education of his followers may point to further Anselmian influences. In chapter one of the *Vita Alfege*, Osbern discusses Alfege's life before he became a monk, and comments on his studies:

> When he (Alfege) had read and reread all that seemed sufficient for his well-being, he directed his entire study of philosophy towards loving God, desiring to know him always, to obey him, to bear his yoke.[43]

The description of Alfege's intellectual pursuits can be usefully compared with contemporary practices at Bec. Osbern's identification that Alfege's 'philosophia' was dedicated towards loving, knowing and obeying God echoes Anselm's own intellectual objectives.[44] Anselm's corpus of works, his prayers, meditations and his theological works are fundamentally all aimed to draw their reader towards the contemplation and love of God. The *Prefaces* to the *Monologion* and *Proslogion* suggest that the works were the result of spiritual lessons given

[42] *VA*, p. 16 n.

[43] *Vita Alfege*, p. 30. Osbern, *VA*, p. 123: Lectis ergo & perlectis quae saluti videbantur sufficientia, totum philosophiae stadium convertit ad diligendum Deum, illum semper nosse, illi parere, illius jugo mancipari desiderans.

[44] See discussion: G. E. M. Gasper, 'Theology at Le Bec', in *A companion to the abbey of Le Bec in the central middle ages (11th-13th centuries)*, eds. B. Pohl & L. L. Gathagan (Boston: Brill, 2018), pp. 206-227, at p. 207. Anselm never, in fact, refers to his work as philosophy, but other contemporary authors identify Anselm as writing philosophy, for example, Orderic Vitalis. See: Orderic Vitalis, *Historia Ecclesiastia*, ed. M. Chibnall, 6 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969-1980), vol. 2, p. 295.

to others and of personal contemplation respectively. Anselm's study and teaching was intended primarily to inculcate a closer relationship with God, for himself and for others. Anselm explains this in a letter, advising his friend, Arnulf of Beauvais, a former master in the schools of northern France and then monk of Canterbury:

> You do not choose a place where you can profit others and teach others, but rather where you can make progress through others and can learn about spiritual service from others. This is how you will make orderly progress if you strive to be taught before you teach.[45]

Progress in this context clearly means progress towards God. In this letter, Anselm states that the primary purpose of education should be to assist student and teacher grow closer to God, which echoes Osbern's description of Alfege's attitude. This view of education and learning also appears in the *Vita Anselmi*, where Eadmer explains Anselm's attitude:

> And so it came about that, being continually given up to God and to spiritual exercise, he attained such a height of divine speculation, that he was able by God's help to see into and unravel many most obscure and previously insoluble questions about the divinity of God and about our faith, and to prove by plain arguments that what he said was firm and catholic truth. For he had so much faith in the Holy Scriptures, that he firmly and inviolably believed that there was nothing in them that deviated in any way from the path of solid truth. Hence he applied his whole mind to this end, that according to his faith he might be found worthy to see with the eye of reason those things in the Holy Scriptures which, as he felt, lay hidden in deep obscurity.[46]

---

[45] Anselm, *Ep.* 38: nec locum ubi vos aliis prodesse alios que instruere, sed ubi vos per alios proficere et ab aliis ad spiritualem militiam instrui possitis, eligatis. Sic enim ordinate proficietis, si prius doceri quam docere appetieritis.

[46] *VA*, I, vii: Factumque est ut soli Deo, coelestibusque disciplinis jugiter occupatus, intantum speculationis divinae culinen ascenderit, ut obscurissimas, et ante tempus suum insolutas de divinitate Dei et nostra fide quaestiones, Deo reserante perspiceret, ac perspectas enodaret, apertisque rationibus quae dicebat rata et catholica esse probaret. Divinis namque Scripturis tantam fidem adhibebat ut indissolubili firmitate cordis crederet nihil in eis esse, quod solidae veritatis tramitem ullo modo exiret. Quapropter summo studio animum ad hoc intenderat, quatenus juxta fidem suam mentis ratione mereretur percipere, quae in ipsis sensit multa caligine tecta latere.

The *Vitae* of other Canterbury saints such as Dunstan also comment on the learning of their subjects, but Osbern's particular mention of Alfege's study as being both philosophical and directed towards the development of a closer relationship with God is not only reminiscent of Anselm's own views on the matter, but is also absent from other Canterbury *Vitae*.[47] As Osbern had studied under Anselm, it is reasonable to assume that Osbern was familiar with Anselm's views on the purpose of education. Osbern's description of Alfege's attitude towards study and education may be derived from Anselm's own example.

In addition to this similarity between Alfege and Anselm's views on the spiritual role of education, there are further possible echoes of Anselmian themes in Osbern's discussion of Alfege's teaching. In chapter three of the *Vita Alfege*, after describing Alfege's oral preaching (itself Anselmian, as discussed above), Osbern then further comments on Alfege's spiritual teaching: 'He (Alfege) taught them (his followers) to rein in their carnal desires by the harness of reason [*rationis*]'.[48] Using reason in the service of spiritual advancement, although by no means exclusively Anselmian, nevertheless is a theme that lay close to the heart of his theological writing of the 1070s. The *Monologion* had a primary purpose, as described in the *Preface* and in chapter one, to educate a reader spiritually who might be utterly ignorant of God using reason alone.[49] In chapter one, Anselm explains:

[47] Osbern made a similar effort to establish Dunstan's scholarship, using an extended quotation from Boethius' *De arithmetica* to demonstrate Dunstan's mathematical skills, and also mentions Dunstan's study as being 'Philosophorum'. For discussion of the Boethius quote see: Rubenstein, 'The life and writings of Osbern of Canterbury', p. 38. For the mention of philosophy: Osbern, *VD*, pp. 77-79.

[48] *Vita Alfege*, p. 33. Osbern, *VA*, p. 124: Atque ut carnales appetitus rationis fraeno moderentur.

[49] In the *Preface*, Anselm writes: For the writing of this meditation they prescribed—in accordance more with their own wishes than with the ease of the task or with my ability—the following format: that nothing at all in the meditation would be argued on Scriptural authority, but that in unembellished style and by unsophisticated arguments and with uncomplicated disputation rational necessity would tersely prove to be the case, and truth's clarity would openly manifest to be the case, whatever the conclusion resulting from the distinct inquiries would declare. Anselm*, Monologion,* Preface: Cujus scilicet scribendae meditationis magis secundum suam voluntatem, quam secundum rei facilitatem aut meam possibilitatem, hanc mihi formam praestituerunt: quatenus auctoritate Scripturae penitus nihil in ea persuaderetur; sed quidquid per singulas investigationes finis assereret, id ita esse plano stylo et vulgaribus argumentis, simplicique disputatione, et rationis necessitas breviter cogeret, et veritatis claritas patenter ostenderet.

> Thus, with reason [*ratione*] guiding and with him (the reader) following, he may then rationally [*rationabiliter*] advance to the matters of which he is unreasonably ignorant.[50]

The appropriate use of reason in spiritual advancement is one of the stated intentions of the *Monologion* in which Anselm emphasises the importance of argument developed through reason. Osbern's report that Alfege used an identical method to bring his students closer to God may suggest a line of influence from Anselm. Given that Osbern was staying at Bec during the process of the *Monologion'*s composition and that, as Anselm stated himself, the text came out of discussion with his fellow monks, this mention of Alfege's use of reason in a similar vein may be by way of homage to Anselm's teachings.

In addition to the parallels between Anselm and Alfege in terms of character and in narrative events, there are generic similarities in the way in which a number of details are presented in Eadmer's report of Anselm and Osbern's of Alfege. These might be coincidental, but equally might reflect the same source for their transmission, namely Anselm himself, in oral record. It is possible that it was Anselm who recounted these stories to the two authors, and linked certain details together in particular ways. There are several chapters where the positioning or pairing of themes or topics is identical across the two texts.

In both the *Vita Anselmi* and the *Vita Alfege*, after the initial commentary on discretion (discussed above) the narrative moves towards accounts of their respective subjects' sleeping and eating habits. In the *Vita Alfege*, Osbern states that Alfege often remained awake when other men slept, and prayed until the sun rose, when he retired.[51] It is worth noting that Anselm's nocturnal habits are also featured in the *Vita Anselmi*, where Eadmer explains that: 'he slept hardly at all – often not at all – before matins.'[52] Both texts then also comment on their subjects' habits when eating, Osbern recording that: 'He (Alfege) ate just enough for his friends to refute that he had not eaten at all'.[53] This description of Alfege's habits is mirrored

[50] Anselm, *Monologion*, I: ut deinde ratione ducente et illa prosequente ad ea, quae irrationabiliter ignorat, rationabiliter proficiat.

[51] Osbern, *VA*, p. 127. Osbern is clearly using a narratorial strategy and comparing Alfege to Christ in the garden of Gethsemane in this passage (compare with Luke 22:39-46).

[52] *VA*, I, viii: Et vix parum ante nocturnas vigilias sepeque nichil somni capiebat.

[53] *Vita Alfege*, p. 41. Osbern, *VA*, p. 127: Ita ut nec edisse a confidentibus redargui potuisset.

in Eadmer's comment in this chapter that Anselm 'ate most sparingly'.[54] In both cases, there is the suggestion that the consumption of food in these instances is minor but is related to companions or friends of the subject of the respective works. Directly before Osbern discusses Alfege's food consumption, he comments that: 'Although he showed extreme pity and kindness to everyone else, he appeared wicked and cruel to himself.' Osbern then describes ways in which Alfege was 'cruel' to himself, explaining common monastic habits like the deprivation of food and sleep. In Eadmer's account of Anselm's habits, in the later chapter where he discusses Anselm's customary behaviour at the dining table, Eadmer mentions Anselm's frugal eating habits:

> But if he saw anyone eating hastily because he was waiting, or perhaps leaving his food, he used to reprove them and affectionately urge them to look after themselves without any hesitation.[55]

A parallel can be identified between the two subjects' mortification of their own bodies, and their lack of encouragement of this practice in others. The point where the two *Vitae* diverge from each other is the extent of their subjects' fasting. Whereas Osbern's explanation of Alfege's fasting describes him as becoming extremely emaciated and makes this a primary feature of the story, Eadmer mentions Anselm's thinness: 'when he became prior he so emaciated his body with fasting…', but does not make this a major focus of his account.[56] Nevertheless, the positioning of an identical interpretation of discretion alongside identical attitudes towards food consumption and sleeping habits may have resulted from the accounts sharing a common source. As with the twin narratives discussed earlier, the details of these cases are not identical at every point, but parallel features run through both accounts. Moreover, although discussion of fasting or vigils in hagiographical texts is often stock, reflecting expectations in the Rule, for example, there are shared idiosyncrasies deriving from the behaviour of Anselm, as abbot of Bec.

---

[54] *VA*, I, viii, ii, xi. Eadmer later describes Anselm at the dining table, where his companions who sat next to him (one of them being Eadmer himself) attempted to 'ply' him with bread to encourage him to eat.

[55] *VA*, II, xi: Quod si aliquem cerneret aut pro sui exspectatione celerius comedentem, aut forte cibum relinquentem, utrumque redarguebat, et quo suo commodo nihil haesitantes operam darent, affectuose admonebat. Eadmer's presentation of Anselm's views on fasting is discussed in chapter two of this thesis.

[56] *VA*, I, viii: Cum ab initio prioratus sui tanta corpus suum inedia maceraverit.

The following chapter of the *Vita Alfege* addresses Alfege's generosity and his attitude towards charity. Here, again, Alfege's behaviour as described finds certain similarities with Anselm's especially concerning attitudes towards 'private property'. The chapter opens by again referring to Alfege's discretion, before discussing Alfege's dislike of private property, explaining that: 'He (Alfege) thought it a great and terrible wrong if any man should want to keep for his private property what nature produced for the common good.'[57] Osbern then expounds that this point of view came from Alfege's belief in the Pauline notion of the church as the mystical body of Christ, and a conviction of Christian charity as being a communal undertaking. In the *Vita Anselmi*, Eadmer states that Anselm had 'a great horror of having anything belonging to him', commenting:

> For even then reason taught him that all the riches of the world were created by our common Father for the common good of all mankind and that by natural law they belonged no more to one man than to another.[58]

Eadmer also explains that even as a secular man, Anselm was often driven to give his possessions away out of love for others.

Although this is a monastic tenet, and both excerpts echo chapter 33 of the Rule, the emphases are slightly different. Chapter 33, referencing Acts 4:32, instructs: 'Let all things be common to all, as Scripture says, so that no one may presume to call anything his own.'[59] This chapter orders that things in a monastery should be considered communal, in order to drive out the sin of avarice. Both Anselm and Alfege echo an idea which is closer to the original section in Acts, which suggests that naturally, the primitive community would share their goods out of charity. Therefore, logically no one is able call anything his own. There is a subtle distinction between these two explanations.

Osbern's reference to Acts is explicit; he alludes to the subsequent verses of Acts 4 in a short discourse on the charitable expectations of property owners. Neither Osbern nor

---

[57] *Vita Alfege*, p. 42. Osbern, *VA*, p. 128: Immane horrendumque nefas reputans, si quod natura commune instituit, hoc velit homo usurpare privatum.

[58] *VA*, I, xxiii: Quantum horruerit habere aliquid proprii. Num utilitate ab uno omnium Patre creatas…

[59] St. Benedict, *Benedict's Rule*, ed. and trans. Kardong, RB 33: Omniaque omnibus sint communia, ut scriptum est, ne quisquam suum aliquid dicat vel præsumat.

Eadmer suggest that this expectation is relevant only to monastic communities, but rather they stress its application to 'all mankind' or 'any man' and both authors extend this to the whole of 'nature'. Despite emphasising their respective subjects' dislike of private property, Eadmer mentions that Anselm has a 'store' and Osbern remarks that Alfege has the 'church's treasures'.[60] In both cases, the accounts place emphasis on the particular use to which these goods are put, or perhaps even on the will of the subject in question. Ownership is not explicitly negative in either text, and in both cases, is linked with the biblical ideal of communal Christian charity rather than the Rule's warning that private ownership could lead to avarice. As these two texts share similar emphases which are distinct from the focus in the Rule, they may share a common source in Anselm.

In addition to specific parallels between the events and details of the *Vita Anselmi* and the *Vita Alfege*, contextual similarities exist between these two texts. There are certain background features in the *Vita Alfege* that may reflect the circumstances of Osbern's own monastic experiences at post-conquest Canterbury and Bec, rather than pre-Conquest Canterbury. In chapter ten of the *Vita Alfege*, after discussing Alfege's attitudes towards private property and referencing the passage in Acts 4, Osbern moves onto the topic of charity and generosity. Osbern has Alfege comment on the generosity of other religious groups in comparison with Christians, effectively reversing the meaning of the passage in Acts which discusses the generosity of the first Christian community. Osbern then records Alfege's preaching regarding the attacks of the Jews (and heathens) on 'Christ, the faith and the religion of Christianity'. Alfege continues, discussing the Jewish and heathen generosity with money within their own groups and warns of the subsequent invitation of criticism if Christians do not also show the same inter-religious generosity. In an extended piece of direct speech, Alfege preaches:

> 'Look at the Jew, and consider the Heathen!' he said. 'Observe with what great love they are bound to each other for the sake of preserving their religion. You will see that among them no-one labours for want of family property: they would be eager to relieve any such man by pouring money on him. While these men see us deficient in that virtue, to which they are drawn by natural affection, they are in truth being

[60] *VA*, I, xxiii: Sua copia. *Vita Alfege*, p. 43. Osbern, *VA*, p. 128: thesauros Ecclesiae.

instructed through divine teaching. With a blasphemous mouth they attack Christ, the faith and religion of Christians, the expectation of bliss to come. So on whom does that blasphemy chiefly reflect, if not those who disdain to help the poor and feel compassion?' [61]

There is no record of permanent settlements of Jews in England before the Norman Conquest; the first recorded settlement arrived from Rouen in 1070.[62] Perhaps because of this inter-religious contact, the late eleventh century had seen the rise in popularity of texts written in the form of inter-religious dialogues.

Anselm was part of the intellectual group producing treatises which specifically addressed the Jewish denial of the divinity of Christ, and many of the authors were either Anselm's students or were associated with Anselm's circle. Anselm's own *Cur Deus homo* was written in the period 1094-8, and addressed the objections of unbelievers in dialogue form. Whether this text was connected to Jewish people has been debated, but if Anselm did not directly address the Jews, his friend and pupil Gilbert Crispin did.[63] Gilbert probably wrote his *Disputatio Iudei et Christiani* in 1092 or 1093, in which a dialogue on the Christian faith is carried out between Gilbert and a Jewish acquaintance in Anselm's style of open disputation and rational argument.[64] Other authors of this sort of disputation are also linked to Anselm,

[61] *Vita Alfege*, p. 42. Osbern, *VA*, p. 128: 'Attende, ait, Judaeum; intuere Paganum; observa quanto sibi invicem pro religionis suae custodia amore foederantur; & videbis inter eos rei penuria familiaris neminem laborare, quem non statim congesti in virum pecunia studeant relevare. Qui dum nos ejus virtutis inopes conspiciunt, ad quam ii quidem per naturalem affectum trahuntur, illi vero per divinam eruditionem instruuntur; blasphemo ore impetunt Christum, Christianorum fidem & religionem, futurae beatitudinis expectationem. Quos igitur ista blasphemia principaliter respicit, nisi eos qui miseris adesse despiciunt per affectum compassionis?'

[62] R. R. Mundill, *The King's Jews: Money, Massacre and Exodus in Medieval England* (London: Continuum, 2010), pp. 4-5.

[63] J. Gauss, 'Anselm von Canterbury. Zur Begegnung aud Auseinandersetzung der Religionem', *Saeculum* 17 (1966), pp. 277-363 at p. 357. Southern, *Portrait*, pp. 198-202.

[64] For a discussion, see: A. Sapir Abulafia, 'An attempt by Gilbert Crispin, abbot of Westminster at a rational argument in the Jewish-Christian debate', *Studia Monastica*, vol. xxvi (1984), pp. 55-74. A. Sapir Abulafia, 'Jewish-Christian disputations and the twelfth-century renaissance' *Journal of Medieval History* 15:2 (1989), pp. 105-125.

including Odo of Tournai and Ralph of Battle.[65] Odo wrote his *Disputatio contra ludaeum Leonem nomine de adventu Christi filii Dei* before 1099. This author was believed to have been one of Anselm's students. Odo shared the view that original sin is the result of the loss of original justice and Anselm's understanding of adequate satisfaction which is found in *Cur Deus homo*.[66] Ralph wrote a disputation which was similar to Gilbert's dialogue: a discussion between Sciens and Nesciens. This work starts with a sceptic who refuses to believe anything for which he has not the evidence of his eyes. The discussion gradually leads him to accept the evidence of his other senses and then, finally, to posit the existence of an invisible intelligence as a source of knowledge (a First Cause).[67] Originally a monk at Bec, Ralph had travelled to Canterbury with Lanfranc and also wrote a collection of prayers and meditations in the style which paralleled Anselm's. These texts are all related to Anselm and to the Bec circle of which Osbern had been a part.

The association in the *Vita Alfege* between Jews and money appears to reflect late eleventh-century attitudes, and the suggestion of Jews as questioners or attackers of Christianity is to some extent mirrored by Anselm's own concerns which appear in the *Cur Deus homo*. The discussion in the *Vita Alfege* of how individual Christians' poor behaviour can incite criticism of the entire religion by a separate religious group seems likely to reflect concerns of a Christian community living alongside religious others. In his reflection on the generosity of other religious groups when compared to the Christian, Osbern highlights a perceived lack of Christian charity at the 'possessors of riches'. The focus on this one specific issue may suggest that a concern with Christianity's reputation was commonly known and that, accordingly, Osbern may have expected his audience to recognise this problem. Although Osbern claimed that he was recording details of Alfege's life as reported by oral sources at Canterbury, there is no similar parallel of these very contemporary issues in earlier

[65] B. Goebel, S. Niskanen & S. Sønneyson, *Ralph von Battle: Dialoge zur philosophischen Theologie* (Feiburg: Verlag Herder, 2015).

[66] T. D. Hughes, 'Odo of Tournai, Scholar and Holy man', unpublished DPhil thesis (University of Oxford, 2000).

[67] For Ralph's career and writings see *The Chronicle of Battle Abbey*, ed. and trans. Eleanor Searle (Oxford, 1980), pp. 116-32; and Southern, *Portrait*, pp. 372-76. A further dialogue, *De peccatore qui desperat*, in an early twelfth-century manuscript from Rochester appears to have been prepared under Ralph's direction, if not written by Ralph himself.

hagiography written at Canterbury. As Osbern appears to have based Alfege on the figure of Anselm, it is plausible that the interest derives from Anselm's own preaching or teaching at Bec.

Alfege is often presented in a manner different to established Canterbury saints such as Oda and Dunstan, who, as discussed in chapter one of this thesis, are characterised in similar ways, for example in their response to challenges to their authority. In the *Vita Alfege*, the figure of Dunstan appears in contrast to Alfege. Osbern includes a chapter dedicated to the figure of Dunstan, and presents this saint in a way which conforms to previous Canterbury authors. In this chapter, themes common to Dunstan's life: exile, the court, severity and stern discipline are particularly associated with Dunstan.[68] By contrast Alfege is a distinct and different church leader. Osbern presents two images of an ideal monastic leader despite their differing characters and attitudes: an established Canterbury figure alongside a character who resembles the contemporary Abbot Anselm. Osbern's inclusion of both characters in the *Vita Alfege* suggests a capacity and perhaps intention to reconcile older styles of ecclesiastical figures with new ideas.

Unlike the case of the *Vita Alfege*, Osbern's *Vita Dunstani* does not incorporate Anselmian themes into its subject in any profound fashion. In the latter work Osbern uses a similar characterisation of Dunstan to that which had established and deployed in the *Vita Alfege.* Dunstan's *miracula* as recorded by Osbern, may, by comparison, be seen to contain similar Anselmian influences as can be found in the *Vita Alfege.*

Dunstan's miracles were recent material which Osbern was writing. As in the case of the text of the *Vita Alfege*, this original material may have offered Osbern the opportunity to interpret events without altering Dunstan's character in ways which might have affected the community. Osbern's presentation of these events suggests the reinterpretation of established customs in the light of new ideas arriving from Bec in the years after the Norman Conquest. Osbern may have been seeking to reconcile potentially opposing notions, and align a Canterbury saint with the new and Anselmian ideas of moderation and discretion.

[68] *Vita Alfege*, p. 37. Osbern, *VA*, p. 126.

Dunstan's intervention in the schoolmasters' beating of their students is a case where the narrative may, in fact, derive from an Anselmian example. As discussed, Anselm had atypical views on violent punishment and correction, especially when directed towards the young.[69] Anselm is known to have taken a particular interest in the progress of adolescents, as he believed that character was formed when a student was young, and could be moulded with the right guidance.

In the *miracula* of Dunstan, the student beating is recorded to have been intended as a punishment 'pro culpis quas commiseramus [for the faults that we had committed]'. Nevertheless, the 'vir bonus' Dean Godric intervenes, complaining of:

> This utter absurdity of you men throwing up cruelty onto the innocent, and after the utter sweetness of our father Dunstan, who has shown the agreeableness of his pity onto us sinners.[70]

There is a second incident, where the instance of the schoolmasters beating their students is repeated. This beating is attributed to the rage of the schoolmasters, who are 'accustomed' to beating the boys.[71] In this second case, Dunstan appears to one of the Canterbury boys and asks that the community remove the body of a pagan boy from the church, but the prior disbelieves the vision. The failure to act on the vision results in Dunstan leaving the church in anger and the conflagration at Canterbury in 1067. These events occur within a few lines and are clearly intended to form one narrative arc. Osbern makes it clear that Dunstan leaves the church as a direct result of the prior's refusal to believe the vision, and the fire follows directly after Dunstan's departure. The presentation of Dunstan as having a sympathetic attitude towards young sinners does not reflect the Anglo-Saxon presentation of Dunstan as a stern enforcer of discipline which was itself adopted by Osbern in his *Vita Alfege*. Both this sympathetic view advocating restraint when disciplining the young and the instance of Dunstan preferring to appear to a Canterbury boy than a more senior member of the community may reflect Anselmian influence within this narrative.

---

[69] *VA*, I, xxii.

[70] Osbern, *VD*, p. 138: Vos hic homines ineptissimi, crudelitatem in innocentiam evomitis, et dulcissimus pater noster Dunstanus suavitatem misericordiae suae in nos peccatores ostendit.

[71] Osbern, *VD*, p. 140. The verb used is: solito.

Eadmer also records this event in his miracles of Dunstan, but specifies that the beating was 'not for any sins committed but out of custom', transforming this violence into an arbitrary cruelty without any justification.[72] In Eadmer's text, the incident occurs only once and is not shown to prefigure the burning of the church.[73]

Osbern and Anselmian Theology

There is a second source of influence in Osbern's writing which can be traced back to Anselm, namely the influence of his theological writings. Osbern was a resident at Bec in the 1070s, a formative period in Anselm's writing career. The *Monologion*, *Proslogion*, various of the prayers and meditations, and possibly the *De grammatico*, were all composed in this period, and it seems reasonable to posit that the *De veritate-De libertate arbitrii-De casu diaboli* were in the process of conceptualisation. Theological ideas from Anselm's treatises can be found in Osbern's hagiographical writing. These themes develop between the writing of the earlier *Vita Alfege* and the later *Vita Dunstani* in a path that correlates with the development of Anselm's own theological ideas. One of the most frequently occurring aspects of Anselmian theological method which appears in Osbern's *Vita Alfege* is related to notions of intention: the uprightness of will to carry out an action that is just. In *De veritate*, a treatise written by Anselm at some point between 1080 and 1086 (and whose preface implies prior discussion) Anselm argues that right action alone is insufficient to merit justice. In this dialogue, Anselm argues:

> Teacher: What if someone understands rightly or acts rightly but does not will rightly: will anyone praise him on account of justice?
>
> Student: No.

[72] *VD*, pp. 171-173: Non pro commissis culpis, sed pro usu inferebatur.

[73] Eadmer inserts a similar incident into the *Vita Bregwine*, where the saint protects schoolboys from their masters. The phrasing suggests it may have been drawn from either Osbern or Eadmer's miracles of Dunstan. See: Eadmer, *Vita Bregwine* in B. W. Scholtz, 'Eadmer's life of Bregwine, archbishop of Canterbury, 761-764', *Traditio* 22 (1966), pp. 127-48, at p. 143.

> Teacher: Therefore, this justice is not rightness of knowledge or rightness of action but is rightness of will.[74]

Elsewhere in *De veritate*, Anselm discusses badly-willed actions in terms of lies and falsehood, suggesting that it is the agent's will and thought which signifies the truth of a deed, or conversely of the 'lie' inherent within the action.[75]

This same idea appears numerous times in the text of the *Vita Alfege*, incorporated into Alfege's teaching and the narrative of Alfege's life. In chapter three of the *Vita*, Osbern discusses Alfege's preaching, where Alfege appears to suggest that the truth of an action exists in the heart of the agent, rather than being inherent in the action itself. Recording Alfege's alleged words, Osbern writes:

> What will happen in the case of a man who hasn't a scrap of truth but who all the time offers a false appearance to all eyes?…. Who pretends one thing in his dress, but tells a different story in his heart? Falsehood is at work not only in the movement of one's lips, but in the display of signs. From this it follows that the intelligent man should recollect that on the day of destruction of the wicked, what great sorrow, what great confusion will encompass those whom all men now call good.[76]

This excerpt reproaches those who outwardly act in a pious fashion, but who conceal ill intent in their heart or thoughts. Alfege's recorded words are much less technical and complex than the phrasing in Anselm's theological treatise, and the two authors use different terms to put their arguments across. Nevertheless, Alfege's argument, as presented by Osbern, that external appearances of actions can be deceptive and that truth is only contained within the

---

[74] Anselm, *De veritate*, 12: MAG. Quid, si quis recte intelligit, aut recte operatur, non autem recte velit; laudabit eum quisquam de justitia? DISC. Non. MAG. Ergo non est ista justitia scientiae rectitudo, aut rectitudo actionis; sed rectitudo voluntatis.

[75] Anselm, *De veritate*, 9.

[76] *Vita Alfege*, pp. 32-33. Osbern, *VA*, p. 124: Quid de iis siet, qui calculum veri nunquam tenent, sed omni tempore omnium oculis speciem obtendunt falsitatis?... cum aluid simulat in veste, aluid gestat in corde? Neque enim solo motu labiorum salisitas operator, sed ostentatione signorum. Quapropter hinc colligere sensatus debet, in die perditionis impiorum quantus dolor, quanta eos confusio comitabitur, quos nunc omnium vox justos appellat…

heart of an agent may have been influenced by the *De veritate*, where Anselm discusses actions in terms of false signification.

There are numerous points in the text where Osbern makes a clear distinction between the action of an agent and their internal thought or intention. At the pivotal moment of the life, where Osbern narrates Alfege's refusal to buy peace with the Danish raiders and ransom himself with a sum of money, this separation between thought and action occurs. In Alfege's reply to the raiders, Osbern writes:

> The deputation is not a legitimate one, since what is sought is something which can justly be denied to the seeker. It can be denied with justice, because it cannot be reasonably considered.[77]

This justification of Alfege's refusal to co-operate with the raiders draws the significance of the decision back to internal thought: Alfege states that he cannot 'reasonably consider' the deputation. At this point in the text, Osbern may be attempting to incorporate elements of Anselm's rather complicated defence of Alfege's refusal. Eadmer's record of the 1079 debate regarding Alfege's sanctity has Anselm arguing that Alfege was attempting to will 'justice [*iustitia*]' when he refused to buy his freedom with money, which would impoverish his men, making him a bad lord.[78] In the *Vita Alfege*, the related term 'ius' appears in Osbern's defence of Alfege's action. Osbern's version of Anselm's actual defence does not parallel Eadmer's, and consists of a more rudimentary portrayal of Anselm's ideas. However, despite the differences between these cases, the emphasis in Osbern's defence upon 'justice' and the focus on internal thought as being significant to this justice seems to reflect the Anselmian notion of the importance of right will in right action. Osbern outlines the justness of an action in terms of the agent's internal thought, that is to say, will.

Osbern's interest in the interaction between will and action underpins a number of events in the *Vita Alfege*. One prominent example of this exploration of action and will is in chapter twenty-five, where the Devil appears as an angel to the imprisoned Alfege.[79] In this

---

[77] *Vita Alfege*, p. 68. Osbern, *VA*, p. 138: 'Legatio,' inquit, 'Legitima non est; cum id petitur, quod petenti iure denegari potest. Iure autem denegari potest, quod ratione haberi non potest.'

[78] *VA*, I, xxx.

[79] Osbern, *VA*, pp. 138-140.

disguise, the Devil tricks Alfege into leaving his prison cell, using examples of Christ's behaviour to cajole Alfege into leaving. Once Alfege has left his prison, he is then abandoned by the Devil in the marshes. Osbern explains the Devil's deceit:

> He (the Devil) covered the force of his rage with the cloak of piety… He became virtue in his external appearance, not in truth. He became an Angel in his face, not in works.[80]

Osbern uses the metaphor of clothing to separate the Devil's will and action, drawing a distinction between the Devil's external appearance and actions, and the 'truth', his will. This description of the Devil disguising his evil nature in the 'cloak of piety' may be a continuation of the Anselmian clothing metaphor which Osbern incorporated into reports of Alfege's teaching (discussed earlier in this chapter). This example is an instance where Osbern is clearly distinguishing between will and action to highlight the conflict between the Devil's action and intent. Osbern is using an Anselmian metaphor to explore this Anselmian theme. This excerpt has similarities with both Anselm's theological writings and the description of his preaching which survives in the *Vita Anselmi*.

Osbern narrates how, after being lured out of his cell by the Devil who has disguised himself as an Angel, Alfege is then abandoned by the Devil in the marshes. The archbishop bewails his plight until a real angel appears and commands Alfege to return to his prison. Osbern writes:

> The saint replied that he was not running away, but was obeying the command of a divine messenger, the angel said: 'That was not a divine command, but a word of a diabolical spite. He did not want to rescue you from prison, but only to seduce you outside the prison.'[81]

Osbern's narrative suggests that both the Devil's action of calling Alfege from his prison and Alfege's response of following the Devil are morally ambiguous unless the will of the agent is

[80] *Vita Alfege*, p. 70. Osbern, *VA*, p. 138: Tegit ergo argumentum furoris velamine pietatis; fraude conatur elidere, quem terroris magnitudine non potuit superare. Fit virtus specie, non veritate: Angelus ore, non operatione.

[81] *Vita Alfege*, p. 72. Osbern, *VA*, p. 139: Cui cum retulisset sacerdos, non se fugere, sed divini nuncii paruisse imperio; 'Non hoc, ait, imperium fuit divinitatis, sed diabolicae malignitatis commentum; nec tam te ille de carcere educere, quam extra carcerem voluit seducere.'

considered. When luring Alfege from his cell, the Devil could have been attempting to rescue Alfege from the prison or to lead him stray. It is the Devil's intention to seduce Alfege outside the prison which makes his action evil, not the action itself. In choosing to leave, Alfege may have been fleeing or acting in obedience to an angel. Further, Osbern gives various examples from the Bible to establish that there would be precedent for Alfege to be rescued from prison. Alfege may have been acting in error when he followed the Devil, but his action alone was not incorrect because it was willed from a position of obedience. The angel does not rebuke Alfege for having been deceived by the Devil and instead reassures Alfege, before ordering him to return to his prison. Osbern's presentation of the characters and actions of the Angel and the Devil in this passage highlights that the difference between these spirits is contained in their wills. This account of Alfege and the Devil suggests that a good and an evil action can be interchangeable, and that these actions only become good or evil through the agent's intention. Intention or inner thought reoccurs as a deciding factor in morality throughout the *Vita Alfege*, perhaps a reference to Anselm's justification of Alfege's sanctity as being contained within his will.

In the story of Alfege and the Devil, Osbern has a clear preference for will over action as an indication of the morality of a deed. This emphasis on will at the expense of action does, in fact, differ, from Anselm's teachings as presented in *De veritate*, where he argues that an actor is only righteous if he/she has right will in right action.[82] This is made clear in chapter twelve of *De veritate*. This argument conflicts with Osbern's presentation of will and action; in the *Vita Alfege* Osbern identifies actions which could be sinful, but are performed from the will to do good. Osbern appears to suggest that an action is made right by an agent's right will, rather than an action having a correlative moral value. In the story of Alfege and the Devil, both could be seen to sin. Alfege follows the Devil's will and the Devil wills evil against Alfege, but only the Devil is cast as sinful since Alfege's right will seems to discount the apparent sinfulness of his action. This argument mirrors the thinking behind Eadmer's report of Anselm's justification of Alfege's martyrdom. Alfege's action of refusing to buy himself off with money was disputed as a sufficient reason for sainthood; Anselm's argument puts the rationalisation for Alfege's martyrdom on his intention of willing justice, rather than his action

[82] Anselm, *De veritate*, 12.

alone. In Eadmer's *Vita Anselmi*, Anselm is shown to present actions as being interchangeable, suggesting that it could be assumed that if Alfege refused to buy his freedom, he would also refuse to deny Christ. The focus on Alfege's will as the dominant factor of sanctity in this debate casts actions as lesser importance than the will of an agent. In this way Osbern's repeated preference for will as the principal ethical element can still be regarded as engagement with Anselm's defence of Alfege's sanctity.

The wider implications of Osbern's preference for will as a ruling factor in ethics become pivotal in a particularly intriguing event near the end of the *Vita Alfege*. In chapter twenty-nine, Osbern describes the death of Alfege:

> Then indeed the Devil's henchmen, with cruelty frothing on their breath, were no longer able to endure the weight of his (Alfege's) words. They leapt forth from their seats with the spring of the swiftest lions, and struck the man with their axe-hafts. Then others severally flung stones at him. And now he was on the very brink of life. Thinking of Christ hanging on the cross for the good of all, he knelt down on his right knee and pressed his left food on the ground, uttering this prayer both for himself and for those who tirelessly tired him: 'Only son of the highest father, Lord Jesus, who came into this world through the Virgin's womb to save sinners, receive me in peace, and pity these men.' Then he fell to the ground, and rising again finally he spoke these last words. 'Good Shepherd, only Shepherd: watch over the sons of the Church. As I die, I entrust them to your care.' There came running up a certain man whom he (Alfege) had taken from the sacred spring (the font). When he saw Alfege struggling still longer on the edge of death, moved by piety to an impious deed, he struck his axe in his head. At once Alfege came to rest in everlasting peace, and directed his victorious spirit in triumph to the heavens.[83]

[83] *Vita Alfege*, p. 77. Osbern, *VA*, pp. 140-1: Tum vero Satellites Diaboli venenato spiritu crudelitatem spumantes, nec iam pondus verborum illius ferre potentes, impetu acerrimorum leonum esedibus prosiliunt, aversis securibus virum dejiciunt. Deinde alii atque alii eum lapidibus obruunt. Jamque ad ingressum vitae erat; cum memor Christi Domini pro omnium salute in cruce pendentis dextrum genu sinistrum vero pedem telluri impressit: hanc cum pro se tum pro iis, qui se infatigabiliter fatigabant, orationem assumens. 'Altissimi Patris unigenite fili Domine Jesu, qui per uterum intactae virginis venisti in hunc mundum peccatores salvos facere; et me in pace suscipe, & istis miserere. Ac prolapsus interram, iterumque resurgens, Denuo sic ait: 'Pastor

Here Osbern narrates the attack on Alfege by the raiders, but the killing blow is struck by an anonymous Christian man, who is 'moved by piety to an impious deed'. Any thinker who is exploring the interaction between will and action and is considering the possibility that morality is ultimately decided by intention will come to this dilemma. Murder is expressly prohibited in the Ten Commandments in the Old Testament.[84] Osbern's narration of Alfege's death introduces one of the most difficult scenarios which naturally arises from this author's consideration of will and action. In the death scene, Osbern appears to be asking the question as to whether a good intention ever justifies or makes good an indisputably 'evil' action. The unnamed Christian man who Alfege baptised has killed an innocent man. This Christian man has willed piety, but has committed an unquestionably impious action.

A reader might assume that given Osbern's preference for will as being the deciding factor in cases such as Alfege and the Devil, Osbern might again favour will in this scenario. However, Osbern does not offer a judgement on the Christian man's actions, and this man is not mentioned again in the *Vita Alfege*. In the excerpt above, Osbern neither condemns nor justifies this killing, nor does he express his own ambivalence or uncertainty over the ethical dilemma. There are a number of indications that Osbern was at least open to the possibility that the Christian man has not sinned. First, it must be relevant that the 'killer' is cast as a Christian rather than a pagan. Second, Osbern reveals that Alfege had baptised this man, which immediately suggests that a personal, perhaps even a spiritual, relationship existed between Alfege and his killer. Third, although Osbern does not comment on the Christian man's morality, the author repeatedly condemns the raiders at this scene, calling them 'the Devil's henchmen'.[85] Osbern continues to denounce the raiders, opening the following chapter by attacking the 'wickedness' of the raiders who committed this 'crime'.[86] The Christian man and his part in Alfege's death goes unmentioned, as Osbern explains that the

bone, Pastor singu laris, filios Ecclesiae, quam tibi moriens commendo, tuere. Accurens autem quidam, quem & ipsum de sacro fonte susceperat, cum videret virum in continio mortis diutius laborantem, impia pietate motus, securim capiti illius infixit. Qui statim in aeterna pace requiescens, victorem spiritum cum triumph dirigit ad coelum.

[84] See: Exodus 20:13 and Deuteronomy 5:17.

[85] *Vita Alfege*, p. 76. Osbern, *VA*, p. 140: Satellites Diaboli.

[86] *Vita Alfege*, p. 77. Osbern, *VA*, p. 141: facinus & sceleris.

Danish raiders seek to cover up their 'crime' by sinking Alfege's body in the river. Osbern does not absolve the Christian man from his involvement in the crime, but instead presents the raiders as being the ones guilty for the murder in the aftermath of the death scene, entirely ignoring the character who struck the killing blow.

The reference in this death scene to the raiders as being 'the Devil's Henchmen' may allude to the story of Alfege and the Devil, which occurs just prior to the death scene.[87] There are a number of unusual similarities in these two narratives. The Devil and the raiders (the 'Devil's henchmen') both leave Alfege in peril after willing evil against him, and Alfege is released from his situation, first by an Angel, and second by the Christian man. In both cases, identical actions are cast as either good or evil through sole consideration of will. In the death scene, both the raiders and the Christian man are using axes to strike Alfege. Their actions are absolutely identical: it is only the intention of the agent which separates one act of cruelty from a second act of kindness. Similarly, in the account of Alfege and the Devil Osbern suggests that identical actions only become good or evil depending on the will of the agent: the Devil's will separates a rescue and a seduction, Alfege's will separates an act of cowardice and an act of obedience. However, whereas Osbern exonerates Alfege from a charge of sin in the story of Alfege and the Devil, the author refrains from making a clear judgement in the case of the Christian man.

Hagiographical works were intended to guide their readers morally, so Osbern's lack of judgement in this question is significant. Throughout the *Vita Alfege* Osbern includes moral commentary, such as in the case of the rebellion in Alfege's monastery or in the conduct of the raiders. Alfege's death is a moral issue which is left ambiguous; the ethical question is raised but not resolved. In this scenario, Osbern is describing a situation involving an act of euthanasia: the Christian man puts an end to Alfege's life to relieve his suffering. Osbern's writing makes clear that Alfege is fatally injured and is enduring a slow, painful death and that the Christian man is attempting to end Alfege's pain out of pity. This lack of moral commentary may suggest that Osbern was fully aware of the complexities of this issue, especially given his exploration of will and action elsewhere in the text.

[87] The Devil appears in chapter twenty-five, the Angel in chapter twenty-six and Alfege returns to his prison cell in twenty-seven. Twenty-eight is a court scene, and Alfege is killed in chapter twenty-nine.

Augustine of Hippo, in particular, wrote specifically on the issue of euthanasia, most notably in the *De civitate Dei*. Although the Bible is ambiguous on the topic of suicide and assisted killings, Augustine argued prominently that suicide is self-murder.[88] He identified potential reasons for suicide, all of which are dismissed as invalid. Any suggestion of a mercy killing as being anything other than sinful conflicts with Augustine's view, that all homicide is murder and violates God's rights over humanity, with the sole exceptions of killings which are part of a Just War or as a capital punishment.[89] A passage in a letter to Dulcitius by Augustine is particularly relevant:

> The books of kings indicate clearly enough that it is not permitted without the command of any laws or legitimate authorities to kill another person, even a person who wants and asks to be killed and is no longer able to live. There King David ordered that the man who killed Saul be put to death, though he had said that Saul, who was wounded and half-dead, had asked him to do this and to release his soul from those torments by one blow of the sword, since it was struggling with its ties to the body and desired to be set free. Hence, because everyone who kills a human being without any authority from a legitimate power is a murderer, whoever kills himself is not a murderer only if he is not a human being. We have said all these things in numerous ways in many of our other discourses and letters.[90]

---

[88] A. Murray, *Suicide in the middle ages: volume 2: the Curse on Self-Murder* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 101-104.

[89] Augustine, *De civitate Dei Corpus Christianorum Series Latina*, eds. B. Dombart & A. Kalb (Turnhout: Brepols, 1955), Book 1, 20.

[90] Augustine, *Ep.* 204, *S. Aureli Augustini Hipponiensis Episcopi Epistulae*, ed. A. Goldbacher, 5 vols (Vienna: Tempsky, 1911), vol. 5: Nullis autem iubentibus legibus uel legitimis potestatibus non licere alterum occidere etiam uolentem et petentem et uiuere iam non ualentem satis indicat scriptura regnorum, ubi rex Dauid regis Saulos interfectorem iussit occidi, cum ille dixisset ab eo iam saucio atque semiuiuo petitum se fuisse, ut hoc faceret et animam corporis nexibus obluctantem soluique cupientem uno ictu uulneris ab illis cruciatibus liberaret. Proinde quia omnis, qui sine ulla legitimaae potestatis auctoritate hominem occidit, homicida est, quisquis se ipsum occidit, non sit homicida, si homo non est. haec omnia multis modis in aliis pluraibus nostris sermonibus et litteris diximus. Augustine, *The Works of Augustine: A translation for the 21st century*, trans. R. Teske (New York: New City Press, 2004), *Ep.* 204.

Augustine's position is clear: all acts of euthanasia or suicide are murder, and are therefore unlawful.

Although this specific letter may not have been available at Canterbury, research carried out by Richard Gameson and Teresa Webber has shown that books of all kinds were being copied and exchanged in increasing numbers during the eleventh and twelfth centuries.[91] There have been attempts to construct the library at Bec and at Canterbury during this period, which show a similar growth in the libraries at these monasteries, and in particular under the guidance of Lanfranc and Anselm.[92] It is likely, therefore, that Osbern would have had access to plenty of patristic material to guide his judgement in this case. Augustine's comment that this view appears across his literary corpus highlights this point. Osbern's decision not to explicitly condemn the Christian man who kills Alfege out of pity is particularly interesting, as it deviates from a fairly unambiguous stance taken by Augustine.

Anselm investigated similar problems in the text of *De veritate*. He avoids exploring this specific ethical dilemma, but the treatise does deal indirectly with the issue where it discusses cases where actions and will are in conflict. In this text Anselm addresses the problem of actions being able to deceive: in chapter twelve he discusses the moral implications of situations where a good action is committed out of pride or coercion - a person

[91] R. Gameson, *The Manuscripts of Early Norman England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 14-21. T. Webber, 'Monastic and Cathedral Book Collections in the late eleventh and twelfth centuries', in *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland*, ed. Peter Hoare, 3 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), vol. 1, pp. 109-125.

[92] For Bec library, see: G. Nortier, *Les bibliothèques médiévales des abbayes bénédictines de Normandie* (Paris: Bibliothèque d'histoire et d'archeologie chretiennes, 1971), pp. 69, 72. For a provisional list of books likely to have been in Bec library in the eleventh century, see: G. E. M. Gasper, *Anselm of Canterbury and his Theological Inheritance* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009), pp. 206-209 – Gasper estimates that *De civitate Dei* would have been at Bec in this period, but does not mention letters. Also L. Cleaver, 'The monastic library at Le Bec', in *A companion to the abbey of Le Bec in the central middle ages (11th-13th centuries)*, eds. B. Pohl & L. L. Gathagan (Boston: Brill, 2018), pp. 171-206. For Canterbury, see: R. Gameson, *The Earliest Books of Canterbury Cathedral: Manuscripts and Fragments to c. 1200* (London: The Bibliographical Society and The British Library, 2008) – the book describes forty-two pre-1200 manuscripts and fragments in the Canterbury Cathedral library and archives in great detail. *De civitate Dei* is not amongst them, but the survey attests to the growth of libraries in this period. For both, see also, Southern, *Biographer*, pp. 18-19, 242-5, 252-253, 267.

committing a 'good' action out of a 'bad' will.[93] The case of Alfege's death explores the opposite case, a 'bad' action coming from a 'good' will, but Anselm may consider this case in chapter eight, where he writes:

> But when a sinner is beaten by one whose prerogative it is not, then a beating both ought and ought not to be, since the sinner ought to get a beating but the other man ought not to give a beating; and so the action cannot be denied to be both right and not right.[94]

It is possible to apply this passage in *De veritate* to Osbern's ethical dilemma of Alfege's death. Using Anselm's logic, Alfege 'ought to' have died, but the Christian man 'ought not' to have killed Alfege. The Christian man's action was not right. When seen through the lens of Anselmian theology, by taking a human life the Christian man is usurping a right which belongs only to God, however well-intentioned the act might be. This casts the killing as undoubtedly a sinful action. In *De veritate* the notion of 'ought' becomes fundamental to later discussions of action, as Anselm considers the actions of inanimate objects which have no will in terms of what 'ought' and 'ought not' to be.[95] It is possible to apply this reasoning to any 'sin' committed from a right will. Similarly, Alfege 'ought not' to follow the Devil's will, even if he was deceived, as he has not the right to do so.

It may be suggested plausibly that Anselm had discussed the problem of right will in wrong action at Bec, at a point before he wrote the final form of the *De veritate*. The text of the *Vita Alfege* is full of echoes of the *De veritate*: the discussions of actions in terms of deception, the presentation of actions as being insufficient in revealing the intention or truth of the agent, the repeated focus on will and the exploration both of wrong will in right action and of right will in wrong action. Osbern's lack of Anselmian terminology and the absence of more complex ideas from *De veritate* may suggest that Osbern's work represents a phase of the Anselmian treatise whilst still in its discussion phase of development. The 'pious impiety'

---

[93] Anselm, *De veritate*, 9, 12.

[94] Anselm, *De veriate*, 8: E contrario, quando ab iniquo justus percutitur, quia nec iste percuti, nec ille percutere debet, ex utraque parte non recta est, quia ex neutra parte debet esse, percussio. Cum vero peccans ab eo ad quem non pertinet percutitur, quoniam et iste debet percuti, et ille non debet percutere, debet et non debet esse percussio: et ideo recta, et non recta negari non potest.

[95] Anselm, *De veritate*, 11, 12.

of the Christian man's action may reflect the evolution of aspects of these discussions, presenting will as the ruling factor may justify actions which are clearly outlawed by established Christian doctrine. Osbern's lack of judgement in this case of right will in wrong action may stem from his own lack of clarity. Although Osbern's theme demands that he absolve the Christian man from the crime of killing, he must have been aware that Anselm would never condone such a deviation from established doctrine, especially from Augustine's teachings. Osbern's ambivalence in the *Vita Alfege* may reflect this tension and could provide some level of commentary on the timing, mode and manner of his familiarity with Anselm's thought. Whether the *Vita Alfege* represents an earlier stage of Anselm's thinking, or the limits of Osbern's understanding of the themes discussed is an intriguing question, although one that depends, largely, on plausible speculation.

When Osbern was writing the *Vita Alfege* in 1080, Anselm had still not, in all likelihood, completed the written versions of the *De veritate-De libertate arbitrii-De casu diaboli*.[96] It is interesting in this context, when was writing the later *Vita Dunstani*, Osbern still does not apply Anselm's reasoning from *De veritate* onto similar cases. In the account of the beating of the young students in Dunstan's *miracula*, Osbern does not dispute that the boys had committed a crime. They 'ought to' be beaten, and their schoolmasters are the ones who 'ought to' beat them. Osbern completely ignores this reasoning and instead focusses the intention behind the action: the masters are motivated by anger. This could reflect the Anselmian view of 'wrong will' in 'right action', but when taken with other examples, probably reflects an instance of Osbern's interest in will as a ruling factor. Eadmer's conflicting presentation of this beating as being due to custom may be a correction of Osbern's narrative, as in this case, the boys are innocent and 'ought not' to receive the beating.[97] By the stage of the composition of the *miracula*, Osbern is likely to have read the final copy of *De veritate*, perhaps acquired through the Bec network. Therefore, Osbern either failed to understand Anselm's reasoning or he chose not to incorporate Anselm's development of the figures of agent and subject and of will and action into this text.

[96] Anselm, *Ep.* 97.

[97] *VD*, pp. 171-173: Non pro commissis culpis, sed pro usu inferebatur.

In the *Vita Dunstani*, there is another instance of Osbern depicting an agent performing a morally ambiguous action, but one that is motivated by pious intention. Osbern describes how Archbishop Dunstan used bribery to persuade King Ethelred to abandon a siege he was holding on the city of Rochester, which was having a devastating effect on church lands.[98] At first, the inclusion of Dunstan's involvement in bribery seems bizarre and inconsistent, especially given Osbern's authorship of the *Vita Alfege*. This second text appears to condemn the use of bribery, even at times when it might be a pragmatic choice. Eadmer, when he rewrites Osbern's work, removes the entire account of Dunstan bribing Ethelred.[99] Osbern's report of Dunstan's involvement in bribery may reflect a continuation of Osbern's understanding of will and action as presented in the *Vita Alfege.* Osbern describes how Dunstan willed to save church lands by paying off a tyrant. It is Dunstan's intention which appears to be fundamental to the ethics of this case, as in the depiction of bribery in the *Vita Alfege*. Alfege did not wish to save himself because his will was for justice, and he would be despoiling church lands by willing his own survival. By contrast, Dunstan is willing to support the church. The ethics of bribery in these cases seem to depend entirely on the agent's intention, which explains why one man is a saint for refusing to bribe, and a second saint is able to bribe without any condemnation. Eadmer may have removed Dunstan's use of bribery as Dunstan's right will in wrong action does not fit with the reasoning in the final form of *De veritate*.

The *Vita Dunstani* represents several notable developments on the earlier *Vita Alfege*. The *Vita Alfege* does not incorporate specific Anselmian terminology although it is marked by a distinctly Anselmian ethos. It is worth noting that Osbern presumably did not intend the life to be an exposition of the *De veritate*. The *Vita Dunstani*, by contrast, does deploy Anselmian terminology in an appropriate manner, as well as containing ideas from Anselm's later texts. One Anselmian term appears numerous times in Anselmian contexts, the Latin word 'voluntas', which also features heavily in Eadmer's writing. The two authors use this term in different ways. In Eadmer's *Vitae*, the author generally uses this word to refer to the relationship between man's will and God's will. By contrast, Osbern seems to adapt a theme

[98] Osbern, *VD*, p. 117.

[99] Eadmer of Canterbury, *Lives and Miracles of Saints Oda, Dunstan and Oswald,* eds. and trans. A. J. Turner & B. J. Muir (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006), p. lxxiii.

from *De casu diaboli*: the two wills of man. As discussed earlier in this thesis, Eadmer does incorporate this theme into his *Historia*, but not into his hagiographical writing. In Osbern's *Vita Dunstani*, in the bribery scene, after Ethelred has accepted the bribe, Dunstan berates the king: 'Since you have preferred money to God, silver to the Apostle Andrew and your greed to my will [*voluntati*], wickedness will come quickly onto you.'[100] This juxtaposition of money with God, coinage with a saint, and Ethelred's greed with Dunstan's will may reflect Anselmian teaching in *De casu diaboli* that the 'good will' of rational creatures is for the sake of God, and their 'bad will' is for personal benefit. An extract from chapter four of *De casu diaboli* explains of the Devil before he fell: 'He was able to will nothing except what is just or beneficial'.[101] *De casu diaboli* discusses what constitutes a good or bad will, and presents will in a polarised fashion. In Anselm's theological vision, there are only two directions for the will of a rational creature: the will is either for God or for personal advantage. In the cited excerpt from the *Vita Dunstani*, Dunstan's will is compared with God (and therefore, with God's will) and with an apostle, and then is contrasted with a number of cases of Ethelred willing personal benefit.

Osbern's use of this terminology in the *Vita Dunstani* reoccurs in similar contexts; a second example appears when Osbern describes the Devil's attempt to overthrow Dunstan. The section is copied from the author B.'s *Vita Dunstani*, but Osbern's version combines two separate incidents from the B. text, the first where Dunstan is expelled from court by his enemies and the second where the Devil tempts Dunstan to marry.[102] In Osbern's account, the Devil is described as engineering Dunstan's expulsion from court. Osbern writes:

> Therefore, the Devil, with his anger having been inflamed because he had seen the extent of the beginning of the advance to sacredness in the young, tried to lead some

[100] Osbern, *VD*, p. 117: Quoniam praetulisti pecuniam Deo, argentum apostolo, meae voluntati tuam cupiditatem, velociter venient super te mala quae locutus...

[101] Anselm, *De casu diaboli,* 4: Nihil autem velle poterat nisi justitiam, aut commodum.

[102] Author 'B', 'Vita Dunstani', in *Memorials of Saint Dunstan, archbishop of Canterbury*, eds. W. Stubbs (London: Longman & co, 1874), pp. 3-52. at pp. 11-13.

to envy Dunstan, ignorant that his bad will is subject to God and that the good will of God should be performed in man.[103]

This discussion of 'good will' [*bona voluntas*] and 'bad will' [*mala voluntas*], combined with the reference to the Devil, strongly suggests an influence from *De casu diaboli*. In the incident with the Devil in the 'B' text, this author does use the word 'voluntatibus', but without this distinctive Anselmian polarity. It is possible that the appearance of this particular word in the source text may have led Osbern to alter the reference to reflect contemporary ideas.

The absence of similar references in Osbern's *Vita Alfege* and in the source texts may reflect the later date of authorship of the *Vita Dunstani*. When writing the *Vita Alfege*, Osbern may have only been familiar with some of the major concepts of *De veritate*, and therefore, the *Vita Alfege* would not contain the developed ideas or the correct terminology which the *Vita Dunstani* uses. When writing the *Vita Dunstani*, Osbern may have had access to a copy of *De casu diaboli*. Anselm's letters show that he distributed his treatises: Anselm sent the monk Maurice (at Canterbury) a copy of *De casu diaboli*, Hugh of Lyon was sent the *Monologion* and *Proslogion* and Lanfranc a copy of the *Monologion*.[104] It is impossible to know precisely which texts Osbern had read, but it is conceivable that Osbern had read the copy of *De casu diaboli* which was sent to the monk Maurice, given the public nature of medieval letters. It may be that this copy of *De casu diaboli* was what Osbern was most familiar with, as it was present at Canterbury. After the temporary falling out between Lanfranc and Anselm over the style of the *Monologion*, Anselm may not have circulated all his treatises at Canterbury.[105]

---

[103] Osbern, *VD*, p. 81: Accensus ergo furore diabolus, quod tam sanctis principiis iuvenem niti conspiceret, in invidiam aliquorum eum conatus est adducere, ignorans malam voluntatem suam Deo famulari, ad perficiendam Dei bonam voluntatem in homine.

[104] Anselm, *Epp.* 72, 74, 97 & 100. There is a discussion of Maurice's correspondance with Anselm, highlighting Maurice's position as the monk who Anselm sent greetings to others at Canterbury (including Osbern) in: D. E. *Luscombe, '*Bec, Christ Church and the correspondence of St Anselm', *ANS* 18 (1995), pp. 1-17, at p. 9.

[105] Anselm, *Ep.* 77. Lanfranc criticised the *Monologion* for its apparent lack of reliance on authorities, which is recorded in Anselm's response. Southern saw this as a break in the personal relationship between Anselm and Lanfranc, though the extent and duration of this split is unclear. Southern, *Portrait*, p. 51. This was discussed at length in chapter two.

In the text of the *Vita Alfege*, there are stylistic choices in Osbern's writing which are similar to devices used in Anselm's own writing. Shaw, the translator of the *Vita Alfege*, noted that 'Osbern clearly takes pride in his literary style, employing a number of devices to add interest and variety to his narrative'. She also highlighted a number of literary techniques, such as Osbern's use of 'rhythmical' 'repetition and alliteration' and Osbern's 'liking for paradox and antithesis'.[106] Shaw drew out a number of examples to demonstrate Osbern's unusual style of writing, several of which appear to have been influence by Anselm's own literary style. Some typical examples of Osbern's style are: 'But the master and minister of all malice, the Devil – the Devil, I say, who is the master and minister of all malice!'[107] Or: 'Inspired by the humble severity and severe humility of these people…'[108] A number of modern scholars have commented on the use of similar devices in Anselm's writing. Most recently, David Hogg has maintained that Anselm's use of rhythm, repetition, metre in his prayers created a new aesthetic genre. Both of these cases contain the distinctive repetitiveness and contrasting phrases which appear in Anselm's own writing.[109] Shaw tended to attribute the unusual phrasing to Osbern's inherent skill as an author, but when taken with the evidence presented in this chapter as well as in chapter one, it seems far more likely that this reflects an Anselmian influence.[110]

Osbern's use of Anselmian themes in the *Vita Alfege* and *Vita Dunstani* take very different forms, both in style and extent. The incorporation of Anselmian thought into the text of the *Vita Alfege* appear fundamental to the work as a whole; these ideas underpin

---

[106] *Vita Alfege*, pp. 18-19.

[107] *Vita Alfege*, pp. 20, 53. Osbern, *VA*, p. 132: Sed totius malignitatis magister simul ac minister Diabolus, Diabolus inquam totius malignitatis magister simul ac minister.

[108] *Vita Alfege*, pp. 22, 31. Osbern, *VA*, p. 123: Horum igitus humili severitate et severa humilitate.

[109] See, D. Hogg, *Anselm of Canterbury: The Beauty of Theology* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2004), p. 29. There is a great deal of scholarship on Anselm's writing style, see: M. L. Colish, *The mirror of language: A study in the medieval theory of knowledge* (Lincoln: The University of Nebraska Press, 1953). The most recent summary of the scholarship, with analysis is: E. Sweeney, *Anselm of Canterbury and the desire for the word* (Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2012), pp. 74-110. See also, J. Hopkins, *Hermeneutical and Textual problems in the Complete Treatises of St. Anselm* (Toronto/New York: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1976), pp. 128-129.

[110] *Vita Alfege*, p. 22.

story-lines and occur throughout the text. Alfege is fashioned in Anselm's image, and ideas probably taken from the early composition process of the *De veritate* are used to form the narrative of events. The *Vita Dunstani* continues these themes to some extent, and incorporates the ideas of dual wills from the later *De casu diaboli.* The Anselmian themes in the *Vita Dunstani* bear comparison with Eadmer's use of similar themes in his hagiographical writing; both authors tend to insert references into reported speech or attach them to particularly relevant episodes which appeared in a source text. Osbern's two hagiographical works reflect the limited access that the author had to Anselm and his texts. However, they reveal an author who was highly engaged with Anselm's thought.

Chapter 5: The Bec *Vitae* and William of Malmesbury

Anselm's written works, both more formal treatises and letters, had a significant impact on several authors who were writing in the period immediately after Anselm's death. Recent scholarly work has explored the subject of the influence of Anselm's theological work on contemporary theologians, including Gilbert Crispin, Ralph of Battle, Honorius Augustodunensis, Anselm of Laon and Odo of Cambrai.[1] Similarly, Anselm's textual influence can be found in hagiographical and historical works written by Bec and former Bec monks such as Gilbert Crispin and Milo Crispin whose hagiographical works created the founding history of the monastery.[2] The extent to which these authors incorporated prominent themes from Anselm's life into the *Vitae* of historic and near-contemporary Bec figures is a compelling question, especially given the importance of these works to understanding Bec's early history.

[1] A good deal of scholarly work has been conducted on Anselm's impact on contemporary theological writing. These include Ralph of Battle, Odo of Cambrai, Honorius Augustodunensis, Eadmer and Anselm of Laon. See: Southern, *Portrait*, pp. 371-381. R. W. Southern, 'St. Anselm and his English pupils,' *Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 1 (1941) pp. 3-34. G. R. Evans, Anselm's life, works and immediate influence', *The Cambridge Companion to Anselm*, eds. B. Davies and B. Leftow (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 5-31. Scholarship relevant to Gilbert Crispin, see: R. W. Southern, 'St. Anselm and Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster,' *Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 3 (1954), pp. 78-115. Gilbert Crispin, *The Works of Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster*, eds. A. Sapir Abulafia and G. R. Evans (London: British Academy, 1986), pp. xxi-xl. A. Sapir Abulafia, 'An attempt by Gilbert Crispin, abbot of Westminster at a rational argument in the Jewish-Christian debate', *Studia Monastica*, vol. xxvi (1984), pp. 55-74. A. Sapir Abulafia, 'Jewish-Christian disputations and the twelfth-century renaissance' *Journal of Medieval History* 15:2 (1989), pp. 105-125. Scholarship relevant to Ralph of Battle: B. Goebel, S. Niskanen & S. Sønneyson, *Ralph von Battle: Dialoge zur philosophischen Theologie* (Feiburg: Verlag Herder, 2015). Scholarship relevant to Odo of Cambrai, see: T. D. Hughes, 'Odo of Tournai, Scholar and Holy man', unpublished DPhil thesis (University of Oxford, 2000). Scholarship relevant to Honorius Augustodunensis, see: V. I. J. Flint, 'The Sources of the 'Elucidarius' of Honorius Augustodunensis,' *Revue Benedictine* 85 (1975): 190-98. Scholarship relevant to Eadmer, see: K. Ihnat, *Mother of Mary, Bane of the Jews: Devotion to the Virgin Mary in Anglo-Norman England* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016). Scholarship relevant to Anselm of Laon, see: C. Giraud, *Per verba magistri. Anselme de Laon et son ecole au XII siècle* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010). Further, Southern has written on the influence of Anselm's ideas on the works of Elmer, prior of Christ Church, and Rodulfus. See: Southern, *Biographer*, pp. 205-217 and Southern, 'St. Anselm and his English pupils'.

[2] Milo's authorship of a group of later Bec *Vitae* has been questioned, and this is discussed later.

An alternate figure is William of Malmesbury, who was also writing in the period after Anselm's death. William took a different approach to the Bec authors when he incorporated Eadmer's *Historia novorum in Anglia* into a much broader work of history. To examine the impact of Anselm's life and works on these two distinct literary spheres is to investigate ways in which his posthumous influence operated, and the extent to which Anselm's ideas and example were used in Normandy and England.

Background and Context

The monastery at Bec was founded in 1034, an obscure and poor monastic foundation which grew rapidly to become one of the most prominent monastic houses in Normandy. The early history of this abbey is recorded in Gilbert Crispin's *Vita Herluini*, which is the earliest of the Bec tracts, written from c.1109.[3] Gilbert had come to Bec as a child in around 1055, entering the monastery as fifty-ninth on the roll of the Bec monks.[4] He was recognised at Bec as an unusually talented scholar and in his twenties served as a master in the monastic school.[5] When Lanfranc left Bec, he summoned Gilbert to Caen and later to Canterbury, and Gilbert eventually became abbot of Westminster in c.1085. The *Vita Herluini* is Gilbert's only hagiographical work and he is best-known for his theology, writing a number of theological works across his life: the *Disputatio Iudei et Christiani*, *De simoniacis*, *De Spiritu Sancto* and a number of other minor pieces.[6]

There is evidence to suggest that Gilbert considered himself both a friend and student of Anselm's. The two men exchanged fond letters and Gilbert's *Disputatio* and *De Spiritu*

[3] The dating of the *Vita Herluini* is not certain, but scholars generally agree that it was written after Anselm's death in 1109, but before Gilbert's own death in 1117. Abulafia & Evans, *The Works of Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster*, p. xl. S. N. Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec and the Anglo-Norman state 1034-1136* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1981), p. 11.

[4] Abulafia & Evans, *The Works of Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster,* p. xxii.

[5] This is suggested in a letter of Lanfranc's, dated about 1074. Lanfranc, *The letters of Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury*, eds. and trans. H. Clover & M. Gibson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), *Ep.* xiv.

[6] A summary of these works can be found in: J. Armitage Robinson, *Gilbert Crispin Abbot of Westminster: A study of the Abbey under Norman Rule* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911), pp. 51-76. Also see: Abulafia & Evans, *The Works of Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster*, pp. xxv-xl.

Sancto are dedicated to Anselm.[7] In both of these dedications, Gilbert asks Anselm for comments on the treatises, suggesting that they were engaged in a scholarly relationship.[8] While Gilbert was an independent thinker, the theological content of Gilbert's writing has often been interpreted in comparison to Anselm's own. Both Gilbert's deviance from and reliance on Anselm can be seen in Gilbert's theological work, where he borrows heavily from Anselm's theology, but also openly conflicts with Anselm's views at points. One example of this deviance from Anselm occurs in Gilbert's discussion of the Devil's rights in the *Disputatio*. Here Gilbert takes a view of the rights of the Devil which differed from Anselm's own argument, but was commonly held among their contemporaries.[9]

The relationship between Gilbert's theology and Anselm's is well-established, and particularly the links between Gilbert's 'most interesting and most valuable' theological work, the *Disputatio* and Anselm's *Cur Deus homo*.[10] Less well-established is any relationship between Gilbert's only hagiographical work, the *Vita Herluini* and Anselmian thought. The dating of the *Vita Herluini* is not clear, but it must have been completed between Anselm's death in 1109 and Gilbert's own death in 1117. The *Vita Herluini* was later used as a source by Orderic Vitalis, Robert of Torigni and the author of the *Annales Beccenses* to describe the foundation of Bec.[11] Harper-Bill has seen the *Vita Herluini* as an effort primarily to establish

[7] Anselm, *Epp.* 84, 106, 130, 142, 366. Gilbert is mentioned in other letters which Anselm writes to his friends and peers – Anselm, *Epp.* 103, 147, 191.

[8] Gilbert Crispin, 'Disputatio Iudei et Christiani', in *The Works of Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster,* eds. A. Sapir Abulafia & G. R. Evans (London: British Academy, 1986), p. 8. Gilbert Crispin, 'De simoniacis', in *The Works of Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster,* eds. A. Sapir Abulafia & G. R. Evans (London: British Academy, 1986), p. 142.

[9] Abulafia & Evans, *The Works of Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster*, p. xxviii.

[10] Robinson, *Gilbert Crispin Abbot of Westminster*, p. 60

[11] Abulafia & Evans, *The Works of Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster*, p. xl. Orderic Vitalis, *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, ed. and trans. M. Chibnall, 6 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969-80). *Annales Beccenses* ed. A. A. Poree*, Chronique du Francois Carre* (Rouen: C. Meétŕie, 1883), pp. 1-11. Robert of Torigni, *Chronique de Robert de Torigni: Abbe du Mont-Saint-Michel*, ed. L. Delisle, 2 vols (Rouen: Le Brument, 1872-73).

the influence of Bec in both Normandy and England, as the *Vita Herluini* covers Lanfranc's career at Bec and in England and the text also mentions Anselm.[12]

Milo Crispin represents a different and later generation. Precentor of Bec c.1130-1150, he was possibly the author of a number of later hagiographical works written at Bec.[13] These texts include the *Vita Lanfranci*, the *Vita Bosonis*, the *Vita Willelmi*, the *Vita Teobaldi* and the *Vita Letaldi*.[14] The ascription of all these works to Milo is complex and contested and depends on a note in a lost Bec manuscript of the *Vita Lanfranci*, which is included in the D'Archery edition of this work.[15] Only the *Vita Bosonis* and the *Vita Willelmi* are clearly written by Milo, as they appear in his *Vitae Abbatum*, which includes the *Vita Herluini* and *Vita Anselmi*.[16] Margaret Gibson suggested that the *Vita Lanfranci* was written in the late 1130s by a separate author.[17]

Whether or not Milo Crispin was the author of the *Bec Vitae*, they are clearly of Bec provenance, and equally clearly show Anselmian influence. Instead of focussing on the problems of identifying an author, it may be more helpful to focus on the context of these works and their probable production. These lives were all written in the period c.1136-1150 by one or more Bec monks who had access to a number of Anselm's letters, and to Eadmer's

[12] C. Harper-Bill, 'Herluin, Abbot of Bec and his Biographer', *Studies in Church History* XV (1978), pp. 15-25.

[13] A. Collins, *Teacher in Faith and Virtue: Lanfranc of Bec's commentary on St. Paul* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), p. 6.

[14] Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec*, pp. 63-4.

[15] L. D'Archery, *Lanfranci cantuariensis archiepiscopi opera omnia* (Paris: Ioannis Billaine, 1648), p. 19AB. Gibson does not dismiss this evidence but finds it 'thin', noting that there were several others at Bec who may be possible alternative authors. By comparison, Vaughn who translated the *Vita Lanfranci*, the *Vita Bosonis* and the *Vita Willelmi* accepts the d'Archery evidence but disputes Milo's authorship of the *Vita Teobaldi* and the *Vita Letaldi*, arguing that Milo may have only written the first three works listed. Vaughn cites the fact that Milo signed the introduction to the lives of Boso and William as evidence to support this conclusion, as well as unspecified stylistic similarities. What scholars are agreed on is the unreliability of the D'Archery note, as even Vaughn contests the accuracy of this evidence in part. In summary, the authorship of these later Bec lives is very much disputed and there is a lack of evidence to support any strong conclusion. M. Gibson, *Lanfranc of Bec* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), pp. 196-7. Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec*, pp. 63-4.

[16] M. Gibson, 'History of Bec in the Twelfth century' in *The writing of history in the middle ages: essays presented to Richard William Southern*, eds. R. H. C Davis & J. M. Wallace (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), pp. 167-86, at p. 169.

[17] Gibson, 'History of Bec in the Twelfth century', pp. 177-78.

Historia and *Vita Anselmi* and to Gilbert's *Vita Herluini*.[18] The *Vita Lanfranci* appears to share a particularly close relationship with both Eadmer and Gilbert's writing, as it uses the *Vita Anselmi*, the *Historia* and the *Vita Herluini* as sources.[19] The author, whether Milo or anonymous, was writing within the sphere of a Bec tradition established by the examples of Anselm, Lanfranc and Herluin, as recorded by Gilbert and Eadmer.

Another text written around this time was *De libertate Beccensis Monasterii*, written by an unknown monk of Bec (c.1136).[20] Its purpose was to demonstrate Bec's freedom from political control and how this could be maintained by abbots. The text ends with Abbot Boso's death and Abbot Theobald is not mentioned, therefore it was probably written shortly after Boso's death.[21]

The *Vita Theobaldi* and the *Vita Letaldi* are not the subject of discussion in what follows partly because both are very brief. In less than five hundred words, the *Vita Theobaldi* explains that Theobald succeeded Abbot Boso, but soon became archbishop of Canterbury. The text discusses a delay in the consecration of the next abbot, Theobald's struggle with Archbishop Hugh and then turns to affairs in England during King Stephen's reign.[22] The *Vita Letaldi* is even shorter, and details Letard's background and habits as a monk.[23] Milo is also the author of the miracle story *Miraculum quo b. Mariae subvenit Guilelmo Crispino seniori; ubi de nobili Crispinorum genere agitur*, however this text focusses on Milo's ancestors, who

[18] Although Anselm saw fit not to preserve the relevant letters in Lambeth ms. 59, they were preserved at Bec (Anselm, *Epp.* 148, 150, 151 and 155). There is an extended discussion of these letters in S. N. Vaughn, *Anselm of Bec and Robert of Meulan: The innocence of the Dove and the Wisdom of the Serpent* (Berkley: University of California Press, 1987), pp. 135-138.

[19] See M. Gibson, 'Vita Lanfranci', in *Lanfranco di Pavia e L'Europa del secondo XI*, ed. G. d'Onofrio (Rome: Italia Sacra LI, 1995), pp. 661-715 at pp. 665-666. Anselm's infamous defence of Alfege and Anselm's finding of a gold ring appear from the *Vita Anselmi.* Anselm's elevation to the position of archbishopric and details of Lanfranc's business in England is included from the *Historia.* Vaughn notes that the *Vita Lanfranci* is 'somewhat modelled' on Eadmer's *Historia*, as it includes documents and letters in a similar way. Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec,* p. 63.

[20] Gibson, 'History of Bec in the Twelfth century', pp. 177-78.

[21] G. Constable, *Three Treatises from Bec on the Nature of Monastic Life* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), pp. 3-4, 10. Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec and the Anglo-Norman State 1034-1136*, p. 64.

[22] 'Vita Theobaldi' in Migne, *PL*, vol. 150, CL, 733-34.

[23] 'Vita Letardi' in Migne, *PL*, vol. 150, CL, 756-6.

were predominantly laymen and does not appear to have included Anselm's thought. The author of the *De libertate* may have also written *De professionibus monachorum* and *De professionibus abbatum*, neither of which incorporate Anselmian influences in any depth, as well as a vast collection of miracle stories.[24]

A rather different set of circumstances underpin William of Malmesbury's use of Anselmian motifs. Despite these differences, both William and the Bec authors share similar relationships with Anselm, and with Eadmer. There is no evidence that William had a personal relationship with Anselm in the way of Osbern or Eadmer, and instead, William was writing after Anselm's death and using written or verbal accounts of Anselm's behaviour. Further, William's use of Eadmer's texts as the primary sources for Anselm's behaviour and teachings is similar to the Bec authors, although William preferred Eadmer's *Historia Novorum in Anglia* to the *Vita Anselmi* as his primary source. William's inclusion in this chapter presents a point of contrast to the Bec group, and demonstrates the different ways that later authors, now more disconnected from Anselm, chose to interpret Anselm's legacy.

Generally acknowledged as the foremost English historian of the twelfth century, William, in terms of sheer volume of literary output and its value to modern scholarship, stands apart from the other authors studied in this thesis. William was born between 1085 and 1096 and entered the cloister of Malmesbury at an early age.[25] He wrote a number of historical works including the *Gesta pontificum Anglorum*, which incorporated Eadmer's *Historia* into a narrative of the ecclesiastical history of England from Bede to William's own day. The first edition of this work was completed by the middle of 1125. William wrote a companion to this text, the *Gesta regum Anglorum*, which covered the secular history of

[24] Constanble, *Three Treatises from Bec on the Nature of Monastic Life*, p. 3. *De professionibus monachorum*, in *Three Treatises from Bec on the Nature of Monastic Life*, ed. G. Constable and trans. B. S. Smith (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), pp. 29-106. *De professionibus abbatum*, in *Three Treatises from Bec on the Nature of Monastic Life*, ed. G. Constable and trans. B. S. Smith (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), pp. 107-134. Gibson, 'History of Bec in the Twelfth century', p. 177.

[25] The dating of William's birth is unclear. It is discussed by W. Stubbs in his edition of the *Gesta regum Anglorum*: William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, ed. W. Stubbs vol 1. (Eyre and Spottiswooode, 1887), pp. xiii-xvii. This argument is further refined in R. Thomson, *William of Malmesbury* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1987), pp. 199-201.

England, the first edition being written in or soon after February 1126. William's third major historical work was the *Historia novella*, an account of contemporary history. Aside from being a prominent historian, William was also a hagiographer and theologian. Aside from the *Vita Wulfstani*, William wrote the lives of Glastonbury saints: Patrick, Dunstan, Indract and Benignus and composed a number of theological works, such as the *Defloratio Gregorii*, *De Miraculis Beatae Virginis Mariae* and the *Super explanationem Lamentationum Ieremiae*.[26]

William's relationships with Anselm and Eadmer have been discussed by a number of scholars.[27] Although William was acquainted with Anselm's theology, this does not emerge strongly from William's historical writing.[28] The incorporation of the *Historia* into the *Gesta pontificum* retains many of Eadmer's themes, but William does not especially include Anselmian ideas elsewhere in his historical writing in the way of the Canterbury or Bec authors. There are odd cases which appear elsewhere in William's vast body of writing which could bare comparison with the character of Anselm, but these are infrequent. One example of a parallel occurs in William's depiction of Wulfstan, a character who appears both in the *Gesta pontificum* and in William's *Vita Wulfstani.* In the narrative in the *Gesta pontificum*, Wulfstan is described as falling asleep during courts, disinterested in secular matters, but still

[26] A fuller summary of William's literary output can be found in Thomson, *William of Malmesbury*, pp. 6-8.

[27] Thomson, *William of Malmesbury*, p. 5. Thomson suggests that Eadmer may have taught William, although there is no evidence to support this. Thomson also explains that William had an 'intense interest' in Anselm's writings in an area of Thomson's book where discusses William's education. After suggesting that William may have studied at Glastonbury, Thomson then proposes that William may have studied with Anselm, giving the piece of evidence that Anselm may have met William. The importance of the recent scholarship of Sønneyson to this overall thesis has been explored in the introduction. In his 2012 work, Sønneyson identifies the classical and patristic basis to William's understanding of the roles of the Church and King, arguing that William's historical-writing was didactic in intention. In this work, Sønneyson touches on the influence of Anselm's life and writing on William, but does not explore this question in detail. S. Sønnesyn, *William of Malmesbury and the Ethics of History* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2012).

[28] Thomson offers some circumstantial evidence that the two men might have met, based on William's use of *viderimus* to refer to Anselm. Thomson, *William of Malmesbury*, p. 5. *GPA*, 1:194-5. William copied a collection of some of Anselm's tracts and letters and in the *De Miraculis S. Virginis*, William names and quotes Anselm's *Dicta*. Thomson supposes that William may have known this quote from Alexander. Thomson, *William of Malmesbury*, pp. 34, 47-48. For the manuscript which has William's copies of Anselm's letters and treatises see: S. Niskanen, *The Letter Collections of Anselm of Canterbury* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), pp. 56-74.

able to wake up to speak against challengers successfully.[29] This scene is almost identical to Eadmer's description of Anselm's behaviour in the *Vita Anselmi*.[30]

However, elsewhere in William of Malmesbury's writing, Wulfstan has a fairly harsh persona, particularly in the *Vita Wulfstani*, but also in the *Gesta pontificum*. William does not include any of most common Anselmian themes, such as a mild character or Anselmian discipline. This can perhaps be best exemplified by one pivotal scene in the *Vita Wulfstani*: in this case, a married woman makes sexual overtures towards Wulfstan. Wulfstan's response is to box the ears of the woman, 'with such force' [*tanto nisu infregit*] that the noise was audible to observers.[31] In the *Gesta pontificum*, Wulfstan is similarly recorded as beating those who missed mass.[32] This use of violence towards sinners, and especially towards fallen women, is in opposition to Anselm's teachings.[33] There are numerous other cases where Wulfstan acts in a similar fashion or displays anger, both in the *Vita Wulfstani* and in the *Gesta pontificum*, although there are fewer cases in the latter than the former.[34] Further, Wulfstan's lack of learning, abstinence from foods such as meat, his enthusiastic rallying of troops during the rebellion in 1087 and frequent physical encounters with the Devil depict him as a very different bishop to the model of Anselm, as this is depicted in his letter collection and in Eadmer's texts.[35] Although there is one clear parallel, and other weaker similarities might be pried from the *Gesta pontificum*, it is apparent that Wulfstan's character was fundamentally

[29] *GPA*, 140.

[30] *VA,* I, xxvii.

[31] William of Malmesbury, 'Vita Wulfstani' in *William of Malmesbury's Saints' Lives, Lives of SS Wulfstan, Dunstan, Patrick, Benignus and Indract*, eds. M. Winterbottom & R. M. Thomson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), i, 6. This case is discussed in K. A. Fenton, *Gender, Nation and Conquest in the Works of William of Malmesbury* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2008), p. 40. This book has a great number of examples of William's saints acting violently, which indicates that William had no interest in incorporating Anselm's persona or teachings on discipline into the hagiographical texts of other saints. Fenton even highlights violence as being a particular characteristic of William's saints.

[32] *GPA*, 141.

[33] See particularly discussion in chapter one.

[34] *GPA*, 137, 138, 141, 144, 146. For an overview of Wulfstan's violence in the saint's life, see Fenton, p. 40.

[35] Anselm's education, mild character and lack of rage, disapproval of war (even of the First Crusade), corporal punishment and taste for various meats are all prominent themes in Eadmer's *Vita Anselmi* and the letter collection. For a full discussion, with examples, see chapter two.

different to Anselm's own. Kirsten Fenton has observed that William may have reduced the levels of Wulfstan's violence in the *Vita Wulfstani* when writing his own *Gesta pontificum*, and this may correspond with William's approach to the Anselmian themes in Eadmer's *Historia*, where William similarly tempered the level of these themes.

It appears, therefore, that William made no significant attempt to model Wulfstan on Anselm. This would correspond with William's approach elsewhere, and his attempts to moderate Eadmer's themes in the *Historia novorum*. William's work uses themes from a number of theological and historical works and authors, which may reflect William's position as somewhat removed from the Bec-Canterbury circle. Whereas Anselm was a figure of singular importance to this circle, William had far less personal and corporate investment in Anselmian modes of behaviour.

William's narration of Anselm's career takes up a considerable portion of the *Gesta pontificum*, however Anselm is not the main subject of the history. William's authorial agenda was different to Eadmer's. William was writing in a separate location to the Canterbury-Bec circle, and focused on a wider range of historical interests. As a result, William had a different vision of how an ideal ecclesiastic ought to behave. The incorporation of Eadmer's *Historia* into William's *Gesta pontificum* demonstrates how William reshaped Eadmer's writing in an effort to work the account into a much broader work. William's treatment of Eadmer's *Historia* reflects an interest to moderate Eadmer's writing so the character of Anselm could be brought into conformity with the wider political and narrative currents of the *Gesta pontificum*.

There are other contemporary historians with connections with Bec, some closer and some more distant, who show knowledge of Anselm such as Orderic Vitalis and Robert Torigni. These authors had read Eadmer's works and mentioned Anselm in their historical works. However, they do not develop Anselmian themes or language in any depth in their historical accounts so their works will not form part of this discussion.

The Bec *Vitae*, and *De libertate Beccensis Monasterii*

A number of common Anselmian themes run through the *Vitae* and, to a lesser extent, through the *De libertate*. The Bec *Vitae*, comprising the *Vita Herluini, Vita Lanfranci, Vita Bosonis* and the *Vita Willelmi* all explore relationships between ecclesiastical and secular powers; the *De libertate* records a more specific instance. The representation of the power dynamics in these relationships establishes a hierarchy where secular powers answer to spiritual authority, whether that be episcopal or monastic. This hierarchy is often represented in ways which may originate within Anselm's own struggle against his secular lords. Two of the Milo/Anonymous group of texts and the *De libertate* describe an unusually strong opposition from elected candidates when facing the prospect of taking the offices of archbishop or abbot. This theme is particularly intriguing when it occurs in descriptions of Lanfranc's behaviour in the *Vita Lanfranci* as the author deviates from his source text, Gilbert's *Vita Herluini*. Opposition to the prospect of election also appears in the *Vita Bosonis*; the theme closely mirrors incidents from Anselm's own career, as reported in Eadmer's writing and Anselm's letter collection. Eadmer's account of Anselm's ecclesiastical career features prominently his reluctance to be promoted to abbot and later, to archbishop. These elevations were important episodes for the Bec community. When Anselm was chosen as archbishop, Anselm's community was at first unwilling to release him from his duties as their abbot, which led to an exchange of letters which were preserved at Bec.[36] Finally, elements from Anselm's teaching and character appear in descriptions of Abbots Boso and William, in ways which echo Anselm's theological teachings and Eadmer's reports of Anselm's behaviour.

Anselm's relationships and struggles with secular lordship are central themes of Eadmer's *Historia*, where King William Rufus repeatedly insists that Anselm obey him in the same way that Archbishop Lanfranc had obeyed King William I. The power dynamic of Anselm

[36] This was remembered as an important episode by the community - it is described in a detailed account in the *De libertate*. The author of the *De libertate* explains that the brothers at Bec were deeply offended because Anselm accepted the position without acquiring their permission first. They felt deserted. The author writes that: 'Being maintained by both sides, the controversy lasted a very long time' (Quae controversia ex utraque parte multum diuque durauit). The author writes that the community eventually decided to follow Anselm's orders and accept the promotion and elect a new abbot. He then comments that when Anselm sent back his pastoral crosier: 'At this great disorder broke out again' (Ad ista fit iterum magna pertubatio). The author's inclusion of this episode and the repeated emphasis placed on the duration suggests that this episode was both distressing and significant for the community. *De libertate*, pp. 146-149.

and William Rufus' relationship reflects the wider undercurrents of ecclesiastical politics in this period, which became most significant in the reign of King Henry I.[37] This theme also appears across the Bec *Vitae*. Both Gilbert and the Milo/Anon author describe their subjects' struggles with secular authority in a way that closely resembles the explanation of Anselm's own experiences with William Rufus, as recorded in Eadmer's *Historia*. Eadmer's account of this dispute has been explored in chapter three, including Eadmer's use of themes taken from Anselm's defence of Alfege.

Gilbert's *Vita Herluini* includes an account of Herluin's troubles with his secular lord as a knight, in around 1041. This *Vita* was written 1109-1117, more than sixty-five years after the events described and was created, presumably, largely from oral tradition at Bec, Gilbert's own experiences, and perhaps written accounts including Anselm's letters. Thematic parallels between Anselm's contemporary issues and intellectual notions are apparent throughout the *Vita Herluini*. Close reading does not reveal any linguistic parallel with Eadmer's texts which suggests that either Gilbert did not have access to these works (which fits the relative chronology of composition) or that he chose not to make reference to them, or both.[38]

In the *Vita Herluini*, the author explains that whilst in the process of turning to a religious life, Herluin had clashed with his lord Count Gilbert of Brionne. The quarrel intensified when Count Gilbert asked Herluin to go to Duke Robert II and lay a charge against an unnamed Norman. It was Herluin's refusal to carry out these orders which saw his final break from Count Gilbert's court. The author of the *Vita Herluini* explains:

[37] The investiture controversy was one symptom of a wider power struggle between the papacy and secular kings which began between Pope Gregory VII and Roman Emperor Henry IV, but which embroiled Anselm, Pope Paschal II and King Henry. For an overview of the growth of papal power, see: R. H. C. Davis, *A history of Medieval Europe* (New York: Longman Group Limited, 1970), pp. 232-258. For the history of the investiture controversy in England, see: C. Harper-Bill, 'The Anglo-Norman Church' in *A companion to the Anglo-Norman World* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2002), pp. 165-190.

[38] Eadmer's *Historia* and *Vita Anselmi* were completed 1112 and 1114 respectively, so this may be unsurprising.

> But Herluin, that man of peace, completely refused to be the bearer of schemes damaging to anyone. Count Gilbert remained steadfast in his decision, urging and threatening Herluin.[39]

Herluin refused to comply with Count Gilbert's wishes, but faced consequences for this disobedience:

> Immediately his fiefs were seized, yet Herluin did not care; but his peasants also had their possessions destroyed, and for this reason he was very concerned. Therefore, pierced by the complaints and tears of these poor men, he returned to his lord after a few days had elapsed, and with no regard for himself pleaded the cause of the innocent sufferers.[40]

Count Gilbert eventually relented and allowed Herluin to leave in peace. Herluin's strong reaction to the threat to his peasants' property has been seen in the sphere of early Norman power dynamics and the obligations of lordship.[41] Clearly, this is a valid way to treat the episode, but, given the date of writing and authorship, these comments may also reflect contemporary issues and interests. Although Gilbert was recording historical events, he is likely to have been concerned to establish the holiness of Herluin's character and his conformity to Bec conventions. Gilbert may have been influenced by contemporary *exempla*, and perhaps particularly by the behaviour of Bec abbots who followed Herluin, such as Anselm.

This episode shares themes with Anselm's c.1079 defence of Alfege as reported by Eadmer in the *Vita Anselmi*. Herluin's absolute refusal to be 'the bearer of schemes damaging to anyone' is reminiscent of Alfege's similar refusal to 'sin against God even in a small

---

[39] Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec*, p. 70. Gilbert, *VH*, p. 188: At uir pacis ferre damnosa alicui machinamenta penitus recusauit. Perstat dominus in sententia hortans et comminans.

[40] Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec*, p. 70. Gilbert, *VH*, p. 189: Continuo abripiuntur omnia sua, nec curat; uastantur quoque pauperes sui, unde non parua sollicitatur cura. Pauperum ergo transmissus questu et lacrymis post parva dierum interualla rediit ad dominum, nullamque sui curam gerens egit suppliciter causam innoxiorum.

[41] Harper-Bill makes this point: Harper-Bill, 'Herluin, Abbot of Bec and his Biographer', pp. 15-16. Also, see commentary in E. M. C. van Houts, *The Normans in Europe* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), pp. 69-74. The intricacies of this specific case are discussed in E. Z. Tabuteau, *Transfers of Property in Eleventh-century Norman Law* (Carolina: University of Carolina Press, 1988), p. 300.

matter'.[42] Both suggest an absolute refusal to sin, even to the exclusion of what might be deemed as pragmatic. In addition, Herluin's concern for the impoverishment of his men 'with no regard to himself' echoes Eadmer's report of Anselm's comment that Alfege 'preferred to give his life rather than to throw aside charity'.[43] The episode in the *Vita Herluini* directly follows on from Herluin's conversion to the religious life. In the account of the dispute with Count Gilbert, the author emphasises that Herluin's refusal was due to his newfound love of God. The two scenarios are very similar in circumstance: both holy figures are in a conflict with a secular power, and both refuse to put their own safety and welfare above the material well-being of their men. The refusal is, in each case, then attributed to the subject's reluctance to offend God. The presentation of both men as having such an intense fear of sin is comparable with Anselm's commentary in *Cur Deus homo*, where Anselm emphasises how grave the burden of sin is. In chapter twenty-one of this text, Anselm explains the gravity of even so small a sin as taking a single look which is contrary to God's will.[44]

This example in the *Vita Herluini* offers an insight into the inter-related nature of accounts of ecclesiastical resistance to secular authority. As discussed in chapter two, Eadmer's presentation of Anselm's case against William Rufus in the *Historia* and *Vita Anselmi* shares themes with Anselm's defence of Alfege (as described in the *Vita Anselmi*). This includes the use of identical Latin phrasing to draw an explicit parallel between Alfege and Anselm's situations.[45] Further, Eadmer also inserted aspects from Anselm's defence into a scene in the *Vita Wilfridi*, where Bishop Wilfrid is confronted by men who accuse him of interfering in secular affairs.[46] Across these inter-related accounts, Eadmer's presentation of

[42] Compare: Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec*, p. 70. Gilbert, *VH*, p. 188: At uir pacis ferre damnosa alicui machinamenta penitus recusauit, with *VA*, I, xxx: Qui ne leve quidem contra Deum peccatum.

[43] Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec*, p. 70. Gilbert, *VH,* p. 189: nullamque sui curam. *VA*, I, xxx: quando vitam suam maluit dare, quam spreta caritate proximos suos scandalizare.

[44] Anselm, *Cur Deus homo*, 21. An intense fear of sin is a major theme throughout other areas of Anselm's writing, such as in the *Prayers and Meditations*. See: Anselm, *Meditatio ad concitandum timorem*. Anselm, *Deploratio virginitatis male amissae*. Anselm, *Meditatio redemptionis humanae*.

[45] Discussed in chapter two.

[46] See discussion in chapter one.

Anselm's dispute with William Rufus in the *Historia* is similar to Gilbert's account of Herluin's conflict with Count Gilbert.

In the *Historia*, Eadmer explains that when the quarrel between Anselm and William Rufus was well underway, Anselm's peers advise that he give regular gifts of money to the king 'which you will take from your men'.[47] Anselm answers by explaining that he cannot follow this course of action as it would set a dangerous precedent, and further, that he cannot 'rob' his men.[48] Gilbert's presentation of the disagreement between Herluin and Count Gilbert may also, then, reflect a comparison drawn from Anselm's near-contemporary dispute with his king. Gilbert was made abbot of Westminster in c.1085 and had been in close contact with Anselm in the 1090s during his quarrel with William Rufus.[49] It is entirely possible that Anselm himself may have drawn a similarity between his own position and the historic case of Alfege, which Gilbert then adapted into his account of Herluin. All three cases: Anselm's defence of Alfege, Anselm's case against William Rufus and Herluin's case against his lord share distinctly Anselmian themes derived from a variety of sources.

The case that Gilbert's use of these themes was probably taken from Anselm's interpretation of his dispute with William Rufus, however mediated, is strengthened by the existence of further similarities between Gilbert's presentation of Herluin's case and the *Historia*'s account of Anselm's defence against William Rufus. These additional parallels do not appear in Eadmer's report, in the *Vita Anselmi*, of Anselm's defence of Alfege. In the *Vita Herluini*, after Count Gilbert asks Herluin to go to Duke Robert and lay a charge against the unnamed Norman, Gilbert (the author) writes:

---

[47] *HN*, p. 52. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 51: Quam ab hominibus tuis accipies.

[48] *HN*, p. 52. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 51: Homines mei, post obitum venerabilis memoriae Lanfranci antecessoris mei, depraedati sunt et spoliati, et ego cum hucusque nihil eis unde revestiri possint contulerim, jam eos nudos spoliarem, imo spoliatos excoriarem? (My men since the death of my predecessor, Lanfranc of revered memory, have been robbed and stripped and should I, finding them unclothed, when as yet I have contributed nothing to reclothe them strip them bare, or rather, being already stripped, flay the very skin off their backs?)

[49] Abulafia & Evans, *The Works of Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster*, pp. xxvii-xxix. In addition, Gilbert and Anselm were both in England and in scholarly contact during the writing process of the *Cur Deus homo*, which was composed during Anselm's conflicts with William Rufus.

> It was now up to the knight, placed in such a position, to show whether he preferred to serve a heavenly or an earthly lord. But as soon as he acted for the cause of the Lord on high, Herluin thereupon broke the rope by which he was held under the service of an earthly lord.[50]

After Herluin pleads with his lord for clemency, Count Gilbert is moved to pity and listens to Herluin's words: 'In loving the world and being obedient to you, I have neglected God and myself exceedingly until now…'[51] These excerpts suggest that secular and religious duties are fundamentally incompatible. Gilbert (the author) describes Herluin as the perfect knight, but obedience to his lord is shown to be an obstacle to Herluin serving God.[52]

Gilbert's presentation of 'heavenly' and 'earthly' as being in competition with one another, where Herluin is constrained to disobey his secular lord in the pursuit of service to God echoes the description of Anselm's case in Eadmer's *Historia.* In this account of the Council of Rockingham, Anselm is repeatedly asked to put aside every other consideration and 'devote your whole mind to the service of our lord', Anselm's 'earthly king'. Anselm's reply to these demands is to quote 'Render unto Caesar' from the gospels.[53] Eadmer, here,

---

[50] Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec*, p. 70. Gilbert, *VH*, p. 188: Perstat dominus in sententia, hortans et comminans, ut homo sibi intimus uerbum consilii sui ad dominum suum perferendo referat. Agitur ut iam ostendat miles ad utrumlibet positus, cui seruire, superno an terreno domino, malit. Sed mox ut superni causa Domini exegit, illico iste funem**,** quo sub terreni seruitio domini retinebatur, abrupit. Abdicata omnino legatione discedit a curia.

[51] Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec*, p. 70. Gilbert, *VH*, p. 189: 'Saeculum amando et tibi obsequendo nimium Deum ac me ipsum hactenus neglexi.'

[52] In the *Vita Herluini,* before Herluin even considers joining the religious life, Gilbert characterises Herluin as behaving in an admirable fashion, explaining that Herluin 'turned his mind from shameful practises' and committed 'honourable deeds'. Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec*, p. 68. Gilbert, *VH*, p. 186: Ab inhonestis auertabat animum. Honestis que curie magni faciunt. Gilbert's dismissal of even the most honourable knight's claim to holiness is also present in Anselm's thought. Anselm's lack of crusading fervour has been noted. Anselm told would-be crusaders to convert to a monastic life rather than go on Crusade. See also: K. A. Smith, *War and the Making of Medieval Monastic Culture* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2013), p. 110.

[53] *HN*, pp. 57-58, 62. Eadmer, *Historia*, pp. 56-61. See: *HN*, p. 58. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 57: Scilicet, si pure ad voluntatem domini regis consilii tui summam transferre volueris, Reddite quae sunt Caesaris Caesari, et quae sunt Dei Deo & Terreno regi.

presents secular power as obstructing the proper workings of God's servants, due to the conflict between the king's will and God's will.

Further to this, after Herluin is released from Count Gilbert's service, Gilbert (the author) explains that there has been a change in their relationship: 'Hitherto he (Count Gilbert) had loved Herluin as one obedient to him, and now he began to love him as a lord, and willingly obeyed him.'[54] The author has inverted the typical relationship between lord and subordinate; Count Gilbert is rendering obedience to Herluin. This report that the default obedience relationship between these two men changed utterly when Herluin became a holy man very much represents the political hopes of the church in the early twelfth century.

This perceived incompatibility between the demands of God and secular lords reflects the contemporary conflicts and concerns of Gilbert's age, and perhaps less so the situations of early Norman ecclesiastics.[55] Norman bishops and abbots contemporary with Herluin were often in the service of the Norman Duke. In the cases of near-contemporary (to Herluin) archbishops of Rouen, Robert II (989-1037) and Mauger (1037-1055), both were brothers of Norman dukes, became close ducal advisors and were deeply involved in power struggles in Normandy.[56] Their ecclesiastical and secular roles may be difficult to distinguish. This extended to the monastic sphere and Lanfranc, for example, is recorded as acting as William I's counsellor while prior of Bec.[57] As archbishop of Canterbury, Lanfranc showed less anxiety about his service to and relationships with his kings. For example, Lanfranc obtained the king's permission to hold church synods, co-operated in maintaining the independence of the English church from the papacy and replaced English churchmen with Normans. Lanfranc's actions show him working under the king's ultimate authority, seeking to further the interests of the English church alongside William I's political agendas. There appears to be little conflict

[54] Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec*, p. 71. Gilbert, *VH*, p. 189: Quem eatenus ut bene obsequentem sibi amauerat, iam cepit amare ut dominum, ac libens obsequebatur illi.

[55] For a standard prosographical of Norman Benedictine abbey, see: V. Gazeau, *Normannia monastica (Xe-XIIe siècle)* (Caen: Crahm, 2007).

[56] D. C. Douglas, *William the Conqueror* (Berkley: University of California Press, 1992), pp. 32-33, 40-41.

[57] Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec*, p. 76. Gilbert, *VH*, p. 197: Ad administrandam quoque totius regni negotia summus ab ipso Normannie duce Willelmo consiliarius assumitur.

in Lanfranc's perception of his duties.[58] Gilbert's account of Count Gilbert's willingness to become obedient to Herluin after he becomes a holy man does not appear, therefore, to reflect the typical arrangement in early Normandy. The evidence suggests that the obedience-relationship between lord and subordinate remained in place even if the subordinate entered the church. Gilbert may have been incorporating the desired power dynamic from his own period into Count Gilbert and Herluin's relationship. Further, by including Anselmian themes in this account, Gilbert may have been attempting to establish a precedent for Anselm's own near-contemporary case.

A reading of the Milo/Anon author's writing reveals similar uses of Anselmian themes to describe relationships between secular and religious men. There are a number of parallel themes between the *Historia* and the *Vita Lanfranci*, one being the topic of the usurpation of God's power by an earthly king. This theme dominates a large part of the narrative surrounding William Rufus in the *Historia*, where Eadmer portrays William Rufus as actively attempting to usurp God's place in the kingdom. The Milo/Anon author includes an account of an event exploring a similar theme, but with a very different outcome:

> The king (William I), decked with royal crown and robes, sat at table with Lanfranc next to him, a jester, seeing the king sparkling with gold and jewels, cried out in the hall in a loud voice of flattery, 'Behold I see God, behold I see God.' Lanfranc turned to the king and said, 'Don't allow such names to be laid upon you. These things are not for man, but for God. Order him to be given a severe beating, so that he won't ever dare repeat such things.[59]

The Milo/Anon author draws a comparison to the death of Herod in Acts 12:22, explaining that King William I instantly obeyed Lanfranc's instructions, reminding the reader that Herod

[58] Gibson discusses Lanfranc's character and his perception of his duties as archbishop in Gibson, *Lanfranc of Bec*, pp. 182-193.

[59] Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec*, p. 107. Gibson, 'Vita Lanfranci', p. 708: quibus rex coronatus solebat tenere curiam, die festivitatis cum rex dyademate et indumentis regalibus ornatus sederet ad mensam, et Lanfrancus iuxta eum, quidam scurra uidens regem auro et gemmis radiantem, exclamauit in aula, magna adulacionis uoce, et dixit: 'Ecce Deum uideo, ecce Deum uideo.' Lanfrancus conuersus ad regem, ait: 'Nolite talia pati imponi uobis; non sunt hec hominis, sed Dei. Iubete illum acriter uerberari, ne audeat talia iterare.'

was struck down by an angel for the same crime.[60] This narrative may be merely an interesting anecdote that the Milo/Anon author is repeating, however, there are parallels to episodes in the *Historia*. As explored at length in chapter three, Eadmer presented William Rufus' demands for absolute obedience to his will alongside this king's apparent disdain for God's judgement and actions. Although Anselm warned the king of the danger of his blasphemous actions, William Rufus would not listen, and Eadmer interpreted William Rufus' death in the New Forest as God's punishment for the king who had been 'boasting' about his powers.[61] Given the emphasis placed on this theme in Eadmer's *Historia*, the Milo/Anon author may be making a similar allusion and illustrating the correct reaction, where the king obeys the warning of his archbishop and does not suffer death at God's hand as punishment for his pride and usurpation of God's place in the world.

This theme of the appropriate power dynamics between secular and religious bodies also appears in the *Vita Bosonis*. A considerable part of this work focuses on the struggle between King Henry I and abbot-elect Boso (and his monks) as they attempt to come to a resolution over the king's expectation of receiving homage from Boso. In the *Vita Bosonis*, Boso refuses, explaining that the Pope had forbidden churchmen giving homage to any lay person. The author describes an extended period of negotiation, principally made through the Bec monks, and resulting in King Henry's eventual agreement to affirm Boso's election.[62] These events are the most prominent narrative arc in the text and consequently, Boso does not actually take the position of abbot until more than half way through this *Vita*. The author of the *Vita* may have used Anselmian themes to describe this episode in such detail. Further, it is possible that Boso himself may have consciously imitated Anselm's example, as Boso's predecessor and one-time master. According to Eadmer, Anselm had defended his position against the English kings by referring to his obedience to papal authority. Anselm's *exemplum*, transmitted both through the oral history of Bec and through Eadmer's accounts, may have inspired both Boso's stance and the Milo/Anon's author's approach to recording this incident.

[60] Acts 12:21-23 records the death of Herod Agrippa, King of Judea from 41 AD to 44 AD.

[61] Eadmer, *Historia*, pp. 116-117.

[62] Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec*, p. 130. 'Vita Bosonis' in Migne, *PL*, vol. 150, CL, 729.

Depictions of conflicts between secular and monastic powers also occur in another contemporary text, the *De libertate*. This text sought to demonstrate Bec's historic tradition of political liberty and how this liberty had previously been preserved by Bec abbots.[63] The *De libertate* depicts the relationships of three different Norman dukes with Abbots Anselm, William and Boso. King William I and Duke Robert II are shown to have had fairly positive relationships with Abbot Anselm; these cases may reflect the 'correct' behaviour of a secular lord towards abbots. In this text, the final Duke, Henry I, initially challenges Bec's rights, but Abbot-elect Boso and his monks successfully protect Bec from any external influence. The way these relationships are portrayed parallel Anselm's own conception of appropriate relationships between churchmen and their secular counterparts should work and/or its memory.[64]

In the *De libertate*, Anselm is presented as being on relatively good terms with both King William I and his son, Duke Robert. The author describes King William I as respecting the brothers' election of Anselm as abbot. Where the brothers petitioned William I to affirm the election of Anselm, the author writes:

> The duke was greatly pleased because he had learned from them (the Bec monks) the general will of the community and their humble petition, and he ordered the same barons to bring the man (Anselm) to him along with some of the brothers.[65]

King William is shown to be concerned to ensure that Anselm's election reflects the wishes of the community; the king does not seek to interfere in their affairs. The author of the *De libertate* describes Duke Robert as similarly deferring to Anselm on the subject of his replacement. In this text, Duke Robert receives a letter which contains Anselm's suggestions:

---

[63] Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec*, p. 64.

[64] *De libertate*, pp. 137-167.

[65] *De libertate,* pp. 138-9: Dux autem ut cognouit per eos communem uoluntatem conuentus et humilem illorum petitionem, gauisus est ualde, atque isdem baronibus iussit ut ei deducerent uirum cum aliquantis fratribus.

> The duke immediately told his chancellor, Arnulf by name, to read it out to everyone. When it had been read through, the duke addressed them affably saying: 'By God's miracles, we must do what my lord Anselm orders. Let it be done'.[66]

Both King William I and Duke Robert are shown to give full deference to the wishes of Anselm and the community in respect to matters pertaining to the abbey, such as in these cases of succession. Further, these dukes are depicted as acting as protectors of the abbey. For instance, the author of the *De libertate* explains that when Duke Robert learnt that Archbishop William of Rouen sought a profession of obedience from the abbot of Bec, Duke Robert supported the abbey and openly stated that he did not wish for this profession to go ahead.[67]

These descriptions of 'good' relationships between ducal and abbatial powers in the *De libertate* present a reciprocal arrangement. At another point in the text, the author reports that a power struggle between Duke Robert and Count Robert of Meulan engulfed the abbey of Bec, during Anselm's abbacy. In this text, Count Robert initially attempts to bring the abbey under his control by offering Abbot Anselm enlargements to the abbey. Anselm refuses to co-operate with Count Robert and immediately alerts Duke Robert to the scheme. Following this, Anselm then orders the count to comply with the Duke's orders.[68] The presentation of the approach to ducal-abbatial relations apparently taken by King William I and Duke Robert may form a vision of an idealised relationship between the community and their secular lord. The lord is shown to take a no-interference policy to the abbey's affairs, not seeking to dictate the election of its abbots and to defend the abbey's independence. In return, the abbey would act as a faithful sub-ordinate and support its lord's power in the region.

---

[66] *De libertate*, pp. 150-151: Ille statim iussit cancellario suo nomine Ernulfo legere eas coram omnibus. Cunque perlectae fuissent, iocundo affamine dux dixit: 'Per mirablila dei opportet facere quod domnus meus Anselmus iubet, fiat.'

[67] *De libertate*, p. 151. There are clearly issues of competition for political power between ducal and episcopal powers in this description, as abbeys were commonly used as instruments of political influence in early Normandy. Although Robert would have had good reason to object to William seeking this profession of obedience from Bec abbey on political grounds, the author of the *De libertate* depicts the episode as divorced from the wider political considerations.

[68] *De libertate*, pp. 140-147.

By contrast, *De libertate* portrays King Henry I as deviating from the examples set by his brother and father. The author explains that when Boso is elected as Abbot William's replacement, Bec monks travel to King Henry I to inform him of their decision. King Henry's initial reaction is different to that of William I's:

> But they notified king Henry that they had elected their prior, as they were reasonably entitled to do, and with humble supplication made petition that he should consent to their wishes. On hearing this Henry, because he was a violent man, refused flatly.[69]

This encounter leaves no doubt that the monks are acting within their rights; Henry I is refusing their request simply due to his being a 'violent man' [*ferus homo*]. This description is particularly intriguing as it closely resembles Eadmer's depiction of William Rufus in the *Historia*: Anselm identifies William Rufus as having: 'untameable fury of the bull' [*Indomabilis… feritas tauri*].[70] Both descriptions act to invalidate the position of the secular lords in this conflict; William Rufus and Henry are presented as acting irrationally, driven by anger.

In the *De libertate*, the monks persevere and win a clear victory; Boso takes the position of abbot without giving homage.[71] After Boso becomes abbot, the text records Henry's resolution:

> Saying to the abbot among other thing a word worth remembering: 'You must be the abbot for the internal affairs of your order, and I shall be the abbot for external affairs'.[72]

The *De libertate* depicts a relationship between secular and religious powers which promotes the separation of religious and secular jurisdiction. Henry I's statement, quoted above, is key to the text's conception of secular power as being only appropriate outside of the abbey. This

---

[69] *De libertate*, pp. 156-7: Sed electionem quam in priori suo fecerant ut (est) potuerunt et ratio dedit, innotuerunt regi Henrico, et humili supplicatione petierunt ut uoluntati eorum daret consensum. Ille hoc audiens ut ferus homo omnino renuit.

[70] *HN*, p. 36. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 36.

[71] *De libertate*, pp. 164-167.

[72] *De libertate*, pp. 164-167: Dicens inter cetera abbati uerbum dignum memoriae: 'Tu esto abbas intus in ordine tuo, et ego ero abbas in rebus exterioribus.'

is similar to the arrangement that Anselm was seeking with William Rufus in England, as reported in the *Historia*. Anselm's struggles for church business to operate outside of the king's control are extensively documented in this text, and Anselm's use of the 'Render unto Caesar' argument suggests a similar preference for the division of secular and spiritual responsibilities.[73]

One further parallel that appears between the *De libertate*'s account of Boso and Henry's conflict and the *Historia*'s presentation of Anselm and William Rufus' is the role of bishops as acting as aggravators in these disputes. In the *Historia*, Anselm stands alone in his conflict with William Rufus, as the English bishops are portrayed as stirring the conflict or acting as William Rufus' agents.[74] The bishops in the *De libertate* act in a similar manner; the bishop of Lisieux hears of the conflict and is reported to have been 'highly indignant and began to inveigh against the monks' to Archbishop Geoffrey of Rouen.[75] The text reports that when the group of monks come before Henry I, this trend continues:

> When the bishops of Evreux and the bishop Lisieux heard this, they began to complain to the king and said: 'We who are bishops do homage to our lord, and this monk says that in no circumstances will he do what everyone else does.' Although they wanted through these words and some even more bitter to excite the king to anger…[76]

This could simply reflect the default position of bishops of this period as often working as secular lords alongside their duke or king. Nevertheless, in both the *Historia* and the *De*

[73] Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 57: Scilicet, si pure ad voluntatem domini regis consilii tui summam transferre volueris, Reddite quae sunt Caesaris Caesari, et quae sunt Dei Deo & Terreno regi.

[74] In the *Historia*, the princes and bishops are shown to be 'provoking trouble for Anselm…' in an attempt to be 'giving some satisfaction to the king'. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 47: De qua tamen consecratione quidam de episcopis atque principibus conati sunt contra Anselmum scandalum movere, intendentes ad hoc ut eumdem episcopum absolute absque debita professione consecraret. At the Council of Rockingham, the bishops act as William Rufus' mouth piece, arguing against Anselm, who repeatedly rebukes them for not taking his side. Eadmer, *Historia*, pp. 54-65.

[75] *De libertate*, pp. 160-161: Indignatus est nimium, et cepit inuehi uerbis super monachos.

[76] *De libertate*, pp. 160-161: Cum hoc audissent episcopus Ebroicensis et episcopus Luxouiensis, ceperunt nimium murmurare coram rege, et dicere: 'Nos qui episcopi sumus facimus hominium domino nostro, et iste monachus dicit se nullo modo facere quod omnes alii faciunt?' Per hec uerba et multo amariora cum uellent animum regis ad iracundiam concitari…

libertate, the actions of the bishops create a narrative in which the protagonists (Anselm/Boso) appear as isolated from the wider church community.

As noted above, the second significant feature of Anselm's ecclesiastical career in the church was his aversion to promotion. This reluctance is recorded by Eadmer in both the *Vita Anselmi* and the *Historia*, and has been discussed in chapter two.[77] Anselm's professed abhorrence towards ecclesiastical advancement may have influenced the Bec lives written by the Milo/Anon author. However, the same theme does not appear in Gilbert's *Vita Herluini*, which may suggest that Gilbert was writing before Eadmer completed the *Vita Anselmi*.

The Milo/Anon author's incorporation of this theme of exaggerated reluctance can be seen most explicitly when the *Vita Lanfranci* is compared with one of its source texts, the earlier *Vita Herluini*. Gilbert includes a description of Lanfranc's career, on which the Milo/Anon author expands. In the *Vita Herluini*, Gilbert's accounts of the promotions of his subjects are presented without issue. For example, Gilbert narrates Lanfranc's promotion to abbot of Caen as follows:

> At the end of three years, when the abbey church was not yet completed, the venerable Lanfranc, instigator of this undertaking, was appointed abbot of the church of Caen, urged by the pleas of the lord and the chief men of Normandy. The process of building…[78]

[77] Eadmer, *Historia*, pp. 55-68. Reluctance was certainly a prerequisite of ecclesiastical advancement; Gregory the Great's *Pastoral Care* actively encourages prospective clergymen to 'flee from this burden only out of humility'. In line with this guidance, most historical and hagiographical texts present ideal candidates as not seeking their own promotions. However, Eadmer's depiction of Anselm's aversion appears far more exaggerated when compared to other contemporary texts. Eadmer's description of Anselm's hysterical refusal and forcible elevation is a radical departure from the contemporary convention of registering a subject's disinterest, sometimes in a single line, before describing the subject's acceptance. St. Gregory the Great, *Regula pastoralis*, eds. F. Rommel & R. W. Clement (Turnout: Brepols, 2010), Part 1:6: Quod hi qui pondus regiminis per humilitatem fugiunt, tunc uere sunt humiles. Gregory the Great, *Pastoral Care*, trans. H. Davis (Newman Press: New York, 1950) Part I:6.

[78] Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec*, pp. 77-78. Gilbert, *VH*, p. 199: Post triennii uero completionem, sola necdum completa basilica, uenerabilis Lanfrancus cepti operis institutor, tam domini quam Normannie primatum supplicatione coactus, ecclesie Cadomensi abbas praeficitur. Remoratur cepta edificatio aliquantisper...

In this account of Lanfranc's advancement, Gilbert notes the strong encouragement [*coactus*] required, but this point is hardly laboured; Lanfranc is not mentioned as being unwilling. When Lanfranc becomes archbishop of Canterbury, Gilbert continues:

> King William, in accepting the most powerful and only advice they (his magnates) had to give, chose the learned Lanfranc for this purpose. Won over for a number of reasons, Lanfranc was brought across to England and took up the archbishopric of the church of Canterbury, which holds pre-eminence in the islands across the sea… After he had been ordered by the unwilling abbot, very unwilling himself, Lanfranc submitted with unblemished obedience.[79]

Gilbert's description of Lanfranc's advancement is fairly similar to the accounts of promotions by other contemporary authors. Little issue is made of promotion to abbot, aside from a register of verbal encouragement to establish that the candidate is not over-eager. When Lanfranc undertakes his ecclesiastical position, his reluctance is very briefly mentioned in a single line. Gilbert, who was writing 1109-1117, appears to be following a fairly conventional script of expressing the correct attitude of candidates to their advancement.

Gilbert does not expand on Lanfranc's reluctance in any great detail. Lanfranc himself expresses a similar reluctance in a letter to Pope Alexander II. In this letter, Lanfranc explains that he only relented and became archbishop when ordered by bishops, abbots and magnates. The archbishop continues:

> I pleaded failing strength and personal unworthiness, but to no purpose; the excuse that the language was unknown and the native races barbarous weighed nothing with them either. In a word: I assented, I came, I took office.[80]

---

[79] Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec*, p. 79. Gilbert, *VH*, p. 200: rex Willelmus, quod potissmum solumque acceptabat consilium, doctorem supra memoratum ad hoc elegit negotium. Victus multiplici ratione in Angliam traducitur, et, quae insularum transmarinarum primatum obtinet, Cantuariensis ecclesie suscepit praesulatum.

[80] Lanfranc, *The letters of Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury*, eds. and trans. Clover & Gibson, *Ep.* I: Aduersus hoc imbecillitas mearum uirium morumque indignitas prolata in medium nichil profuit, excusatio incognitae linguae gentiumque barbararum nullum apud eos locum inuenire praeualuit. Quid plura? Assensum prebui, ueni, suscepi.

Lanfranc then proceeds to complain about his experiences as archbishop. This letter is similar to the narrative in the *Vita Herluini*; Lanfranc is initially unwilling, but this point is not stressed.

The later Milo/Anon author, writing in the later 1130s, departs from the model of his predecessor and incorporates a more exaggerated style of reluctance. Although the Milo/Anon author's *Vita Lanfranci* uses the *Vita Herluini* as a source for Lanfranc's life, the author deviates from the narrative in his source text and creates a far more detailed account of Lanfranc's professed unwillingness to take up the position of archbishop. The Milo/Anon author explains Lanfranc's initial reaction as follows:

> Lanfranc was seen to be so disturbed by a holy anger and holy sadness that they thought he would totally reject it and seek a breathing-space to deliberate on it. For Lanfranc held it evident, even indisputable, that the busy life of an archbishop and the peaceful existence of a monk were incompatible, apart from which it was his wont to hate his own advancement and fear the huge responsibility of governing. The queen and her son prayed that he would accept; and though Abbot Herluin, whom it was Lanfranc's custom to obey as he would Christ, was unwilling, he ordered him to accept. Even the assembly of great men zealously urged him to accept, for this fierce and wide-spread pressure was prescribed by the command of the king, who knew the obstinacy of this father, dearly loved by him, when he was invited to take up higher positions.[81]

The rest of this chapter continues to describe Lanfranc's reluctance in great detail, transforming the brief mention of Lanfranc's unwillingness in both the *Vita Herluini* and Lanfranc's own letter into an entire chapter in the *Vita Lanfranci*.

[81] Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec*, pp. 96-7. Gibson, 'Vita Lanfranci', pp. 683-4: Et quasi preceptum super hac praelatione, sancta ira sanctaque tristitia sic perturbatum fuisse compererunt ut omnino putarent contradicturum, inducias ad deliberandum petentem. Perspectum namque uel indubitatum tenebat simul ire non posse negocium archipresulis et ocium monachi. Ad hoc sui prouectum solito despiciebat, atque timebat onerosissimum gubernaculum. Precatur regina cum filio, jubet abbas Herluinus, licet inuitus, cui tanquam Christo obedire solitus erat; hortantur etiam studiose ad hoc collecti majors. Nam hanc urgentem undique uiolentiam dictauerat mandatum regis, scientis obstinationem dilectissimi sibi patris cum ad altiora inuitaretur.

There are a number of parallels between the *Vita Lanfranci*'s account of Lanfranc's reluctance when facing promotion and the *Historia*'s description of Anselm's own refusal to become archbishop. Anselm and Lanfranc share a similar initial reaction to the prospect of advancement, one which is both unusually formidable and highly charged with emotion. Eadmer's account of Anselm's response describes the archbishop-elect's physical and mental response: 'Anselm himself was aghast at this pronouncement and turned deadly pale.'[82] The following description of Anselm's objections to the demands of the king and his magnates is remarkably personal as Eadmer depicts Anselm's almost-hysterical fear and indignation. In the above excerpt from the *Vita Lanfranci*, the Milo/anon author details that Lanfranc was disturbed by 'anger' [*ira*] and 'sadness' [*tristitia*]. These strong emotional responses to the prospect of advancement appear as distinct from other examples of the recorded reactions in historical and hagiographical writing, where the character's refusal is generally not recorded with reference to their emotions.[83] This style of narrative seems to be a particular idiosyncrasy of Eadmer's writing, which makes an appearance in the *Vita Lanfranci*.[84]

Lanfranc's stated hesitation to take the position echoes Anselm's own concerns of the difficulties of combining monastic and ecclesiastical life, as reported both in Eadmer's writing and Anselm's own letter collection. The Milo/anon author writes:

[82] Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 32: Expavit Anselmus ad hanc vocem, et expalluit.

[83] A contemporary comparison is given later in this chapter.

[84] Eadmer's distinctive style is partly due to his willingness to record reported speech as even his contemporary and friend, William of Malmesbury avoids doing this, directly stating that he was unwilling to do so. William of Malmesbury, *Vita Wulfstani*, ed. R. R. Darlington (London: Offices of the Society, 1928), p. 2. The combination of Eadmer's very vivid style of narration, the use of reported speech and the detailed descriptions of Anselm's opinions and even feelings makes the *Vita Anselmi* and the *Historia* distinct from other works. The *Vita Willelmi* contains an extended description of Anselm's elevation to the position of archbishop which is clearly taken from Eadmer's *historia* so it is clear that the author and his contemporaries would have had access to a copy of this text. Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec*, p. 11.

> For Lanfranc held it evident, even indisputable, that the busy life of an archbishop and the peaceful existence of a monk were incompatible, apart from which it was his wont to hate his own advancement and fear the huge responsibility of governing.[85]

This suggestion of a perception of incompatibility between monastic and ecclesiastical life does not have an origin in the *Vita Herluini* or Lanfranc's letter collection.[86] However, in the *Vita Anselmi*, Eadmer described Anselm as a figure who detested worldly life and longed for a life solely dedicated to the contemplation of God. This presentation has been discussed at length in chapter two. For instance, Eadmer describes Anselm's experience of exile at the Italian monastery of Telese, Liberi, as follows:

> Thus we took up our abode on the mountain top, as far removed from the thronging crowd as it were in a desert. When Anselm saw this, his spirits rose with the hope of future quiet, and he said: 'This is my resting-place: here I shall live.' He ordered his life therefore on the lines of his early routine before he became abbot which he deplored more than ever having had to give up since he became archbishop: day and night his mind was occupied with acts of holiness, with divine contemplation, and with the unravelling of sacred mysteries.[87]

---

[85] Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec*, p. 96. Gibson, 'Vita Lanfranci', p. 683: Perspectum namque uel indubitatum tenebat simul ire non posse negocium archipresulis et ocium monachi. Ad hoc sui prouectum solito despiciebat, atque timebat onerosissimum gubernaculum.

[86] Gilbert had described Lanfranc as 'administering the business of the whole realm' in his capacity of advisor to Duke William II. Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec*, p. 76. Gilbert, *VH,* p. 197: Ad administrandam quoque totius regni negotia summus ab ipso Normannie duce Willelmo consiliarius assumitur. Gibson, Lanfranc's biographer, describes Lanfranc as a man who managed to combine the duties of monk and bishop, and there is no evidence that Lanfranc had the same views on this topic as Anselm. Gibson, *Lanfranc of Bec*, pp. 191-193. The best example of Gibson's assessment of Lanfranc's character comes in her epilogue. In Lanfranc's letter I, he asks to be released so he could: 'return to the monastic life, which I love more than everything else', but does not identify this same incompatibility. Lanfranc, *The letters of Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury*, eds. and trans. Clover & Gibson, *Ep.* I: uitamque coenobialem quam pre omnibus rebus diligo repetendi licentiam coenobialem

[87] *VA*, II, xxx: Igitur habitatio nostra in montis erat summitate locata, a turbarum tumultu instar solitudinis vacua. Quod Anselmus advertens, ex spe futurae quietis exhilaratus ait: *Haec requies mea, hic habitabo.* Ad primum igitur conversationis ordinem (quem antequam abbas esset habebat, quemque se in pontificatu

This theme is repeated throughout the *Vita Anselmi*.

The suggestion that Lanfranc would prefer the 'peaceful existence of a monk' to the 'busy life of an archbishop' is significant because of a slight conflict with Gregory the Great's *Regula pastoralis*. In chapter five of this text, Gregory condemns those who are gifted yet refuse to undertake the offices of supreme rule. Gregory specifically aims his rebuke against those who flee the call of office in preference for a 'place of quiet'. Towards the end of chapter five, Gregory writes:

> So, there are those who, endowed, as we have said, with great gifts, in their eagerness for the pursuit of contemplation only, decline to be of service to the neighbour by preaching; they love to withdraw in quietude and desire to be alone for meditation. Now, if they are judged strictly on their conduct, they are certainly guilty in proportion to the public service which they were able to afford.[88]

Lanfranc's letter to Alexander conforms to the expectations of Gregory I's guide. In this letter, the archbishop expands on his hospitality as abbot, the teaching he had conducted at the monastery and the services he had rendered to the Pope in this capacity as abbot. There is no mention of a longing for quiet or personal contemplation. By attributing to Lanfranc this concern that the 'busy life' of an archbishop would intrude on his 'peaceful existence' as a monk, the author of the *Vita Lanfranci* gives Lanfranc an attitude which, while being in accordance with Anselm's own, could be seen to deviate from Gregory I's guidance.

Eadmer's emphasis upon the refusal of higher clerical officer in his description of Anselm was unusual. This can be demonstrated through comparison with contemporary historical writing, for example, that of Orderic Vitalis. When discussing the reluctance of

positum maxime perdidisse defleba,) vitam instituit, sanctis operibus, divinae contemplationi, mysticarum rerum enodationi die noctuque mentem intendens.

[88] St. Gregory the Great, *Regula pastoralis*, eds. Rommel & Clement, Part 1:5: Sunt itaque nonnulli qui magnis, ut diximus, muneribus ditati, dum solius contemplationis studiis inardescunt, parere utilitati proximorum in praedicatione refugiunt, secretum quietis diligent, secessum speculationis petunt. De quo si disticte iudicentur, ex tantis procul dubio rei sunt, quantis uenientes ad publicum prodesse potuerunt. Gregory the Great, *Pastoral Care*, trans. Davis, Part I:5.

model candidates for office, Orderic closely follows the guidance of Gregory I.[89] Orderic clearly believed that a candidate ought to approach promotion with disinterest and reluctance, but that the bearing of office was a fundamentally important duty which should not be avoided altogether. Even Orderic's most reluctant candidate-elects take office out of their own free will, after some verbal persuasion. In the case of Orderic's model candidate bishop-elect Guitmund: the author gives details of Guitmund's initial refusal and uses an extended piece of reported speech to detail the reasons for this reluctance. However, at no stage during this narrative does Orderic mention the subject's emotional upset or imply that ecclesiastical duties are incompatible with a monastic lifestyle. Orderic instead has Guitmund referencing the weakness of his soul, the unjustness of the appointment and then making an appeal for fair elections and good kingship.

To return to the account of Lanfranc's elevation in the *Vita Lanfranci*, there are further parallels with Anselm's situation, as described in his letter collection. Both Lanfranc, according to the *Vita Lanfranci*, and Anselm, as he reveals in his letters, encountered resistance to their promotions from their own communities. This objection is described in terms of friendship. In Lanfranc's case, the resistance comes from Abbot Herluin, and in Anselm's case, from the monks of Bec. After Anselm's election, the Bec monks wrote to their abbot, begging him not to abandon his position at Bec (these letters are now lost). Anselm responded, and in Letter 148, wrote:

> Perhaps I should be ashamed that the wounds of grief have so overcome my soul that it is still totally absorbed in thinking about its sudden separation from your souls and the grave peril it is in so that it often produces deep groans and floods of tears…[90]

[89] See the case of Guitmund – Orderic Vitalis, *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, ed. and trans. M. Chibnall, 6 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969-80), vol. 2, pp. 271-281. In Book IV, there is a lengthy rhetorical speech where Guitmund refuses the position, which is partly used to express Orderic's displeasure with non-canonical elections and with the conduct of William I. Guitmund is notably reluctant, yet is still successfully persuaded to take the position of Bishop of Aversa.

[90] Anselm, *Ep.* 148: Forsitan mihi erubescendum est quia vulnera doloris sic animam meam totam intentam in scissiram sui ab animabus vestris et in grave periculum suum superaverunt et adhuc sic superant, ut gemitus profundos fluentibus lacrimis saepe tolerat.

This imagery used here is consonant with the way in which Anselm's speaks of friendship in other contexts. Especially in his earlier letters, Anselm often wrote at length on his pain at his separation from his friends.[91] This was a common theme in Anselm's own letters and also appears in letters written from certain Bec monks to Anselm. Therefore, it may be assumed that the monks would have used the appeal of friendship in their letter to Anselm.

In the *Vita Lanfranci*, the Milo/Anon author states that Abbot Herluin was unwilling to accept Lanfranc's advancement due to the fear of losing a friend:

> Herluin, moreover, ordered it against his own wishes because he was very upset at the prospect of being without the companionship of so very dear and sweet a friend [*dulcissimi amici carere*]…[92]

Lanfranc's own letters are written in a different style to Anselm's; Lanfranc's letters rarely refer to friendship as they are often concerned with more purely matters of ecclesiastical business. This explanation of Herluin's reluctance to accept Lanfranc's advancement contains the same theme from Anselm's early letters, and uses similar wording. Although Anselm saw fit not to preserve the relevant letters in Lambeth ms. 59, they were preserved at Bec, so the author of the *Vita Lanfranci* had access to Anselm's letters to the Bec monks.[93]

The eventual justification for both Herluin and Lanfranc's acceptance of the elevation is also presented in way which resembles Anselm's own acceptance of office, as described both in Anselm's own writing and Eadmer's *Historia*. In the letter cited above from Anselm to the Bec monks, Anselm continued, ordering the monks to accept his decision:

---

[91] For literature on the Anselmian writing on friendship, see: Southern, *Portrait*, pp. 148-151. J. Haseldine, 'Love, Separation and Male Friendship: Words and Actions in Saint Anselm's Letters to his Friends' in *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, ed. D. M. Hadley (London: Longman, 1999), pp. 238-256. Vaughn has examined the place of women in Anselm's friendships – S. N. Vaughn, 'Saint Anselm and His Students Writing about Love: A Theological Foundation for the Rise of Romantic Love in Europe', *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 19:1 (2010), pp. 54-73.

[92] Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec*, p. 97. Gibson, 'Vita Lanfranci', p. 684: Inuitus autem iubebat, quoniam egerrime ferebat tanti ac tam dulcissimi amici carere consortio.

[93] S. N. Vaughn, *Anselm of Bec and Robert of Meulan: The Innocence of the Dove and the Wisdom of the Serpent* (California: University of California Press, 1992), p. 135.

> I consider that there is nothing safer for me to do in this dangerous situation that to put aside my own judgement and will and entrust myself completely to the judgement and will of God [*voluntati dei*].[94]

There is an identical justification of Anselm's elevation by making reference to God's will in Eadmer's *Historia*. When attempting to persuade Anselm to take up the position, the monk Baldwin is recorded as arguing: 'If it is the will of God [*voluntis Dei*] that it should be so, who are we that we should gainsay the will of God [*voluntate Dei*]?'[95] The same argument appears in Lanfranc's case in the *Vita Lanfranci*. Here, when Herluin accepts Lanfranc's promotion, the author explains: 'He (Herluin) bade him (Lanfranc) take the position because he did not dare contradict the will of God [*voluntati Dei*] and the election of Holy Church in their call to Lanfranc.'[96] The author refers to the will of God a second time in this section of text, when discussing Lanfranc's own deliberations of whether to accept the position: 'Therefore, prevailed over, Lanfranc, abbot of Caen, understood that as much by the will of God's [*Dei Voluntate*] anything to do with himself…'[97] In all of these cases, identical Latin wording is used.

Anselm's treatises frequently refer to the will of God, in this formulation. By comparison, Lanfranc's works, which are primarily concerned with grammar, do not use this reference.[98] Further, the Milo/anon author had access to Eadmer's *Historia*, which also employs the same term. The particular use of this reference to justify Lanfranc's election to archbishop closely resembles Anselm's own justification, both from his letters and Eadmer's

---

[94] Anselm*, Ep.* 148: Nihil mihi puto tutius in re tam periculosa, quam ut meum sensum et voluntatem postponens me sensui et voluntati dei penitus committam.

[95] Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 34: Si voluntis Dei est ut ita fiat, nos qui voluntate Dei contradicamus?

[96] Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec*, p. 97. Gibson, 'Vita Lanfranci', p. 684: Praecipiebat ergo illi, quia uoluntati Dei et sancte ecclesie electioni eum uocanti contradicere non audebat.

[97] Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec*, p. 97. Gibson, 'Vita Lanfranci', p. 685: Dictus igitur Lanfrancus Cadomensis abbas tam Dei uoluntate, quam circa se intelligebat…

[98] Lanfranc does refer to 'will', but rarely to God's will. One reference to God's will [*uoluntate dei*] comes in Lanfranc's Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul. Anselm uses the word will far more frequently, and it appears in his letters and in his theological writings, the examples being too many to list. One example of Anselm referring to God's will has already been cited in this chapter.

Historia. The *Vita Lanfranci*'s description of Lanfranc's election, expanded from barely a line in the *Vita Herluini*, appears to have been closely modelled on Anselm's own election.

The Milo/Anon author's incorporation of this heightened sense of a candidate's reluctance extends beyond ecclesiastical positions and includes monastic promotions. In the *Vita Lanfranci*, the author again deviates from the *Vita Herluini* when discussing Lanfranc's promotion to abbot of Caen. In the source-text, Gilbert wrote:

> At the end of three years, when the abbey church was not yet completed, the venerable Lanfranc, the instigator of this undertaking, was appointed abbot of the church of Caen, urged by the pleas of the lord and chief men of Normandy.[99]

A similar tone is evident in the description of Herluin's own promotion to the position of abbot; there is no mention of any anxiety or reluctance on the part of this candidate. Gilbert's narrative conforms with the expectations of the Rule of St. Benedict, which urges abbot-elects to understand the responsibility of their role and to fear God's punishment in the case of failure, but does not carry the same expectation of reluctance as *Regula pastoralis*.[100] Seeking advancement would be against the overall ethos of the Rule, but there is no requirement for candidates to actively attempt to avoid becoming an abbot.

By contrast, Anselm's reaction to the prospect of becoming abbot of Bec is not dissimilar to his reaction when facing elevation to the position of archbishop of Canterbury. Anselm's promotion to abbot is recorded by Eadmer in the *Vita Anselmi*:

[99] Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec*, pp. 77-78. Gilbert, *VH*, p. 199: Post triennii uero completionem, sola necdum completa basilica, uenerabilis Lanfrancus cepti operis institutor, tam domini quam Normannie primatum supplicatione coactus, ecclesie Cadomensi abbas praeficitur.

[100] The incorporation of this Anselmian theme into cases of promotions may be unsurprising. The Milo/Anon author's inclusion of Anselmian elements in the historic case of Lanfranc's promotion may have been inspired by the considerable number of parallels between the positions of the two archbishop-elects. Both Lanfranc and Anselm were Bec monks called by an English king to take the position of Archbishop of Canterbury, and their circumstances were similar.

> The brethren of Bec all with one consent chose Anselm as abbot. But he used every means to evade this, putting forward many and varied reasons why it should not be.[101]

Eadmer adds that Anselm used to testify that he only agreed to take up the role of abbot of Bec after being commanded by Archbishop Maurilius, and as such, was constrained by obedience.

The presentation of extremely reluctant abbots-elect who require extensive persuasion before they are willing to accept promotion appears in the later Bec texts with reference to Abbots Lanfranc, William and Boso. In the *Vita Lanfranci*, the author expands on Gilbert's statement that Lanfranc was promoted to the abbacy of Caen and goes further, explaining Lanfranc's reaction:

> William, cherished this man in sincere friendship, and on account of this love appointed him abbot at the monastery of Caen, though Lanfranc was reluctant… Lanfranc made every attempt to avoid undertaking such a burden, humbly desiring to be a subject rather than a ruler. For he would have gladly renounced the abbacy of Caen, which he received unwillingly if had been able to do it without serious injury to his soul.[102]

There is no expectation in the Rule of this more ardent form of reluctance, which is in contradiction to the evidence from the *Vita Herluini*.

In the *Vita Bosonis* there are marked similarities between Anselm's initial refusal to accept both the abbacy of Bec and the archbishopric of Canterbury and the behaviour of Boso when reacting to his own election. Having been elected by the community at Bec, Boso initially refused to take the office. The Milo/anon author narrates:

---

[101] *VA*, I, xxvi: Uno omnium fratrum Beccensium consensu in abbatem eligitur. Quod ipse omni studio subterfugere gestiens, multas et diversas rationes ne id fieret obtendebat.

[102] Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec*, p. 96. Gibson, 'Vita Lanfranci', p. 682: Gloriosus dux Normannorum Willelmus, hunc praecordiali colebat familiaritate, quapropter coenobio Cadomensi illum prefecit inuitum… Verum toto conamine ille tale onus deuitabat subire, humiliter magis cupiens subesse quam preesse; nam abbatiam Cadomensem quam inuitus susceperat libenter dimisisset, si extra anime lesionem grauem facere ualuisset.

> Then all the monks prostrated themselves on the floor (for they were seated in the chapter house), begged Prior Boso to give his assent to the election I have so often mentioned, and asked the archbishop to force him by commandment… On his side Boso asserted he could not perform the task because of his severe physical weakness, and put forward other serious objections, as though they were sins which rendered him unfit for office.[103]

Boso then adds that he has been forbidden by the Pope to pay homage to any lay person. When fighting his election to the position of archbishop, Anselm complained of being too old and physically weak for the task, amongst a number of other objections. When becoming abbot in the *Vita Anselmi*, as mentioned earlier in this chapter, Anselm only conceded to his community's pressures when he was constrained by his obedience to his archbishop.[104] Further to this, Anselm was also struggling with balancing the expectation of lay homage and his loyalty to the Pope, having been present at Urban II's Easter Council which had outlawed lay homage.

The excessive reluctance which is associated with Lanfranc and Boso in the *Vitae* also becomes a major feature of the reported elections in the *De libertate*, which describes Anselm, William and Boso's promotions to the position of abbot. In the case of Anselm's election, the *De libertate* records that when Anselm heard about his election:

> Coming to the monastery they revealed the duke's order, but on hearing he had been elected he began to show extreme reluctance, just as he had on his election as prior, as is fully described in his biography… Then he (William) ordered a certain bishop who was present to accompany him (Anselm) back to Bec and install him ceremonially in the office of abbot. But Anselm flatly refused to carry the crosier, nor did he wish to do anything he had not been accustomed to do as prior. Because of this the monks hurried through the business so that he might be blessed. But because the church of

[103] Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec*, p. 130. 'Vita Bosonis' in Migne, *PL*, vol. 150, CL, 729A: Tunc omnes, in terram prostrati, (nam in capitulo sedebant), rogabant priorem ut saepe dictae electioni assensum praeberet, et archiepiscopum ut illum praecipiendo cogeret... E contra ille asserebat hoc se non posse facere propter magnam sui corporis debilitatem, et alia quaedam gravia, quasi peccata, opponebat, quibus ad hoc indignum se esse dicebat.

[104] *VA*, I, xxvi.

> Rouen was then without a pastor, on the order of the prince this ceremony was carried out by Gilbert, bishop of Evreux, on the twenty-second of February, in the church of Bec itself, with no mention of profession.[105]

Despite the author's claim that he is repeating events from the *Vita Anselmi*, this description of Anselm's reluctance goes further that the narrative in Anselm's biography, and may reflect issues of investiture which were relevant after Anselm's death. The report that Anselm was reluctant when chosen to be prior does not, in fact, appear in the *Vita Anselmi*, which mentions this promotion without discussing any reaction by Anselm.[106] In addition, the *De libertate's* account of Anselm's behaviour when facing promotion to abbot, especially the detail of Anselm's refusal to carry the staff 'under any circumstances', is not identical to the *Vita Anselmi*.[107] Eadmer gives an extensive account of Anselm's reaction, pleas and tears, but then records how Anselm was persuaded eventually by the brethren and by the expectation of obedience to Archbishop Maurilius. The author of the *De libertate* does not mention Anselm as having given consent to the election, but moves from establishing Anselm's absolute refusal to reporting the monks' haste and then Bishop Gilbert carrying out the function.

This account of Anselm's absolute refusal with no mention of his eventual capitulation is more reminiscent of Eadmer's report of Anselm's elevation to archbishop in the *Historia*.[108] The claim that this account mirrors what is 'fully described in his biography' is incorrect, which may indicate that this author is conflating Anselm's various elevations across Eadmer's

[105] *De libertate*, pp. 138-141: Qui uenientes ad cenobium iussa principis patefecerunt ille uero electus hoc audiens nimium reluctari cepit, sicut supra fecerat in electione (prioratus) ut in uita illius pleniter describitur… Deinde iussit cuidam episcopo qui presens aderat ut eum Beccum reduceret, et in statione abbatis cum honore poneret. Sed Anselmus nullo modo consensit ut bacculum portaret, nec aliquid agere uoluit nisi quantum in prioratu faciebat. Quapropter monachi accelerauerunt negotium ut benediceretur. Sed quia ecclesia Rothomagensis tunc extabat absque pastore, iussu principis Gislebertus Ebroicensis episcopus peregit hoc opus in ipsa Beccensi aecclesia absque ulla mentione professionis viii. Kalendas marcias. The remark that Anselm showed 'excessive reluctance' is interesting as a contemporary comment suggesting that Anselm's reactions to promotion were deemed unusually strong in the eyes of his peers.

[106] *VA*, I, vii.

[107] *De libertate*, pp. 138-141, quotation at p. 140: 'nullo modo'.

[108] Eadmer, *Historia*, pp. 54-67.

texts.[109] Anselm was probably made prior in 1063.[110] Assuming Gibson's c.1136 dating of the *De libertate* is accurate, then this account was written at a time where Anselm's election to prior is very nearly beyond living memory.[111] The author's assumption of Anselm's resistance to any promotion may suggest that this theme was strongly associated with Anselm.

The *De libertate* also gives an account of Abbot-elect Boso's reaction when he faced the same promotion to abbot.[112] This narrative follows the description in the *Vita Bosonis*, and gives details of Boso's refusal, his complaint of physical weakness, and then his explanation of the promise to Pope Urban II not to pay homage to a layman.[113] One possible reason for the presence of the Anselm's excessive reluctance in these accounts of Boso's behaviour may be found within their close relationship in life, which is emphasised in the *De libertate*. When discussing Boso's virtues for the office of abbot, the text's author comments: 'Particularly since he had been trained by the venerable Anselm and imitated his practised so far as he could in every way.'[114] This suggestion that Boso was actively modelling his behaviour on Anselm may account partially for the similarities in their reported elections, and also for other parallels in their characters and teachings.

The character of Abbot Boso, as depicted in the *Vita Bosonis*, employs arguments which are distinctly Anselmian in tone (comparable with examples from Anselm's own writing and the *Historia's* recordings). After Abbot William's death, Abbot-elect Boso's refusal to render homage to King Henry resulted in the Bec monks acting as mediators in a dispute between Boso and King Henry. During this process of negotiation, Boso defends his position to his monks as follows:

---

[109] *De libertate*, p. 141: ut in uita illius pleniter describitur.

[110] *VA*, p. 12n.

[111] Gibson, 'History of Bec in the Twelfth century', pp. 177-78.

[112] Abbot William's elevation is described, but does not contain any comments on his reluctance. This is the same as the *Vita Willelmi*. *De libertate*, pp. 150-151. There is no mention of William making any sign of reluctance or refusing the position of abbot in either of these texts.

[113] *De libertate*, pp. 154-159.

[114] *De libertate*, pp. 54-55: Et maxime quia fuerat ex disciplina uenerabilis Anselmi, et mores illius in aliquibus quammaxime immittabatur.

> Prior Boso spoke to them all: 'Know that from the time when I saw your concerted love for me, even if I had then been quite sure that death was hanging over my head, I would not have refrained from the most prompt obedience to your will [*voluntati*], unless the fear of offending God had stood in my way.[115]

Boso's reasoning is distinctively Anselmian: obedience is owed to those who love the subject, unless this conflicts with God's will, which is supreme. Boso's use of the language of love, obedience and will, in terms which correlate with Anselm's own vocabulary, suggest strongly that this instance is influenced by Anselm's arguments, either made to his monks or to his king.[116]

This same logical sequence appears in Anselm's writing when Anselm is releasing himself from his own monks' demands for obedience. In a letter written to the monks of Bec, Anselm explains:

> True obedience indeed is either to God or to the Church of God and, after God, above all to superiors. When I said 'in the name of the Lord' I did not foreswear or refuse this obedience but rather preserved it. Learn, therefore, what I then gave you. It was this: that I could not withdraw myself from your service by my own will, not seek to be withdrawn from it unless that disposition and obedience to which I was previously servant according to the will of God forced me to do so. This indeed I did even if I acted otherwise than I said; you would certainly not be monks if you demanded that I promise you anything against the will of God.[117]

---

[115] Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec*, p. 130. 'Vita Bosonis' in Migne, *PL*, vol. 150, CL, 729A: Prior autem dixit omnibus: Scitote quia ex quo vidi tam unanimem erga me amorem vestrum, si inde mihi certissime scissem imminere mortem, non omisissem quin voluntati vestrae promptissime paruissem, nisi illa causa obsisteret quia Deum offendere timebam.

[116] The *De libertate* gives an account of Anselm leaving the position of Abbot, the appointment of Abbot William and this account is complete with the Anselmian language. *De libertate*, pp. 146-9. It is likely this account, with the Anselmian language was taken from Anselm's letter collection.

[117] Anselm, *Ep.* 156: Vera autem obedientia aut est Deo, aut Ecclesiae Dei, et post Deum maxime praelatis. Hanc ergo non abjuravi, nec abnegavi; sed potius servavi, cum dixi, In nomine Domini. Discite itaque quid vobis tunc dedi. Hoc utique, ut me vestro non possem subtrahere propria voluntate servitio; nec quaerere ut subtraherer, nisi ea cogente dispositione et obedientia, quarum prius secundum Deum servus eram. Quod

Boso and Anselm are using identical arguments to override the wishes of their communities. Both men acknowledge their duty of obedience, but remind their communities of the supreme nature of God's will. Statements of this sort appear repeatedly in the *Historia*, for example, Anselm's refusal to render obedience to King William, asserting that the king's will was in conflict with God's will.[118]

Aside from Boso's use of Anselmian-style arguments, Boso's reported character and teachings share parallels with those attributed to Anselm. The author of the *Vita Bosonis* describes Boso's character in the following way:

> He loved and was loved by everyone… He was remarkable for his humility, prudent in the spirit of his wisdom, steadfast in resolution, a comfort to the forsaken; he made himself everything for everybody. He helped each individual to the utmost of his power, for he was kind in his encouragement, moderate in his reproaches.[119]

There are certain aspects of this portrayal which reflect the collective memory of Anselm as it existed in Bec in the first two decades of the twelfth century. The comment in the *Vita Bosonis* that Boso was 'loved and was loved by everyone' may be related to Anselm's conversation or writing on love.[120] The *Vita Anselmi* includes a long sermon discussing how loving is as valuable as being loved.[121] An earlier example adduced by Eadmer, concerns Anselm's even-handed consistency:

---

autem feci, si aliter fecissem quam dixi, certe vos monachi non essetis, si quod contra Deum vobis promisissem, exigeretis.

[118] Discussed at length in chapter three.

[119] Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec*, pp. 127-8. 'Vita Bosonis' in Migne, *PL*, vol. 150, CL, 726C: Diligebat cunctos, et diligebatur a cunctis... erat enim honorabilis vitae et multae prudentiae, humilitate conspicuus, spiritu consilii providus, fortitudine firmus, consolabatur desolatos, omnibus omnia factus; in quantum poterat unicuique subveniebat, benignus erat in exhortando, modestus in corripiendo.

[120] Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec*, p. 127. 'Vita Bosonis' in Migne, *PL*, vol. 150, CL, 726C: Diligebat cunctos, et diligebatur a cunctis.

[121] *VA,* I, xxix.

> From this time his (Anselm's) conduct toward all men was such all loved him as if he were a very dear father. For he bore with equanimity the habits and infirmities of them all, and to each, as he saw what was expedient, he supplied what was necessary.[122]

Both the *Vita Bosonis* and the *Vita Anselmi* give loving and being loved significance in these character-portraits. Further, these texts also pair this theme with their subjects' exercising of discretion.[123]

Perhaps the most distinctly Anselmian aspect of Boso's character, as portrayed in the *Vita Bosonis*, is his application of discipline within the community. As evidenced by his letter collection and Eadmer's *Vita Anselmi*, Anselm's particular style of discipline was one which promoted a gentle approach to bring sinners back to God, this has been discussed in chapters one, two and four of this thesis.[124] The *Rule of St. Benedict* instructs abbots on the topic of discipline, notably in chapter two, where the abbot is enjoined as follows:

> Thus he (the Abbot) should discipline the unruly and restless rather sharply, but entreat the obedient, mild and patient to make more progress.[125]

Anselm, according to Eadmer, reasoned that only the obedient can tolerate harsher treatment.[126] The Milo/Anon author does not record Boso as being harsh or violent in his interactions with disobedient or failing monks. When Boso does encounter disobedience, the author describes Boso's reaction as follows:

---

[122] *VA*, I, xiii: Dehinc Anselmus ad monasterium reversus talem se cunctis exhibuit, ut ab omnibus loco charissimi Patris diligeretur. Ipse enim mores omnium et infirmitates aequanimiter sufferebat; et unicuique sicut expedire sciebat, necessaria suggerebat.

[123] *VA*, I, xiii.

[124] *VA*, I, x, xxii. Also see Anselm's mercy to sinners in Anselm, *Epp.* 140, 168 & 169.

[125] St. Benedict, *Benedict's Rule*, ed. and trans. T. G. Kardong (Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1996), RB II: id est indisciplinatos et inquietos debet durius arguere, oboedientes autem et mites et patientes.

[126] *VA*, I, xxii.

> When occasionally it was announced that his orders had not been fulfilled, he would say: 'We often disregard God's commandments, yet he supports us. How much more patient should we be if our orders are neglected.'[127]

In addition to this simple parallel in Boso and Anselm's disciplinary styles, the connection made in the except between man's use of discipline and God's own attitude towards sinners may reflect another layer of Anselmian influence. This vision of an infinitely merciful God, despite being faced constantly with human disobedience, appears in Anselm's *Proslogion*, where Anselm argues that a universally merciful God must, theoretically, be greater than a God who is only occasionally merciful. Anselm concludes that this 'greater' version of God must reflect God's true nature.[128] Boso's use of God's mercy to justify his own more moderate behaviour is very similar to the narrative in the *Historia*, where Anselm is described as making the same statement. This appearance of Anselmian discipline alongside the rationale of modelling this attitude on an Anselmian vision of God is very likely to have originated in Anselm's conversation or writings.

The description of Abbot William, who was Abbot Boso's predecessor, in the *Vita Willelmi* also has characteristics which may have been influenced by Anselm. These differ from those attributed to Boso in the *Vita Bosonis*. The author of the *Vita Willelmi* opens a character-portrait of William which proceeds as follows:

> He (William) behaved with such modesty, humility and mildness that to certain people he sometimes seemed ignorant, even half-simple. But if you were to approach closer and, conducting a careful scrutiny, so to speak, ask his feelings on doubtful questions, you would find high intelligence, profound judgement, and more than anything, a pattern of virtue.[129]

---

[127] Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec*, p. 130. 'Vita Bosonis' in Migne, *PL*, vol. 150, CL, 730B: Aliquando cum ejus jussa non impleri nuntiabatur, dicebat: Saepe mandata Dei, et praeterimus, et sustinet. Quanto magis nos pati debemus, si nostra contemnuntur jussa?

[128] Anselm, *Proslogion*, 9.

[129] Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec*, p. 124. 'Vita Willelmi' in Migne, *PL*, vol. 150, CL, 721A: ita se modeste, humiliter et mansuete habebat ut aliquando quasi nesciens et pene idiota videretur quibusdam; verum si propius accederes, et velut perscrutando ejus sensum de rebus dubiis interrogares, altam prudentiam, profundum consilium, et maxime honestatis documentum invenires.

This portrayal of William as at first appearing simple to observers, but rapidly manifesting shrewdness and intelligence is identical to the way that Eadmer describes Anselm's conduct in the *Historia*. When giving an account of the Council of Rockingham, Eadmer explains that Anselm easily refutes the arguments made by the bishops. The bishop of Durham then complains: 'At first he spoke to each point one by one so weakly and so haltingly that we thought him a simpleton devoid of all human shrewdness.'[130] This is an unusual parallel in these two descriptions. William may have been modelling his behaviour on Anselm's example. Almost immediately after these lines from the *Vita Willelmi*, the author continues: 'He (William) enjoyed nothing in excess, demanded complete awe in religious matters, feared God, and fled from sin, which he hated like a deadly poison.'[131] Anselm's fear of sin forms a prominent part of his character as this is depicted in the *Vita Anselmi*, where Eadmer dedicates a chapter to Anselm's 'horror of sin'.[132]

Despite the likelihood of characteristics having an Anselmian origin, the author of the *Vita Willelmi* does not attribute to William the same Anselmian understanding of discipline which Boso exhibits in the *Vita Bosonis*. Anselmian discipline has been found in texts already explored earlier in this thesis, such as in the *Vita Anselmi*, *Vita Oswaldi* and the *Vita Alfege*. Abbot William, however, is not depicted as employing this same style of discipline. The author of the *Vita Willelmi* states simply that: 'He (William) was… gentle to the good, harsh with the undisciplined.'[133] This attitude conforms to the expectations of the Rule, but differs to the style associated with Anselm and adopted by Boso.

The question of whether Anselmian themes originated with subject or author emerges from Eadmer's accounts of Anselm's life and career. With the cases of the Bec *Vitae*, this question becomes more complex. This is particularly relevant in relation to the *Vitae* of Boso

[130] Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 62: ita imprimis tepide et silenter per singula loquebatur, ut omnis humanae prudentiae inscius et expers putaretur.

[131] Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec*, p. 124. 'Vita Willelmi' in Migne, *PL*, vol. 150, CL, 721B: supra mensuram suam nihil usurpabat, divinis rebus omnem reverentiam exigebat, Deum timebat, peccatum, quasi mortale virus odio habens, fugiebat.

[132] *VA*, II, xv. This fear of sin is also a prominent theme in Anselm's meditations.

[133] Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec*, p. 124. 'Vita Willelmi' in Migne, *PL*, vol. 150, CL, 721B: erat quoque Deo devotus, majoribus submissus, subditis benignus, mansuetus bonis, severus indisciplinatis.

and William, which memorialise the abbots who followed Anselm. In the instance of hagiographical texts dealing with historic abbots and monks such as Herluin and Lanfranc, or the historic Canterbury archbishops who are the subjects of chapter one, it is clear that it is the author of the text who may be reflecting contemporary themes back onto the behaviour of his subject. However, when the subject of a hagiographical work is himself a student and follower of Anselm, it is possible and even likely that this subject may be actively attempting to model his behaviour on Anselm's own. It was not uncommon for abbots and archbishops to use their most significant predecessors as a guide for their own behaviour.

William of Malmesbury

William of Malmesbury falls outside the more intimate circles of Anselmian memorialisation at both Canterbury and Bec, although he was very familiar with Anselm's works and most probably with the community of Christ Church, Canterbury in the 1120s. The extent of William's engagement with Anselm's memory and thought, however, was extensive enough to offer a related, though different, perspective on the ways in which the historical Anselm was mediated and disseminated. William's *Gesta pontificum* includes a large section where the author incorporates Eadmer's *Historia* into the work. William's treatment of the *Historia* has been viewed as a mere inclusion of Eadmer's work, with no manipulation made to the source text at all.[134] Certainly, William does include many of the hallmarks of Eadmer's account, including Anselmian themes and vocabulary, but William also greatly condenses Eadmer's longer account and alters his phrasing, adding in new information. This section will look at three examples of William's modification of Eadmer's text: William's direct alteration of the sense of the *Historia*, his condensation of sections and his additions to the account which reflect the later date of writing. William does not incorporate Anselmian themes into the characters and accounts of other ecclesiastics in any great depth.

In the *Gesta pontificum*, William tends to moderate Eadmer's themes, presenting Anselm as a bishop first, rather than a monk first, then a bishop. This may reflect William's overall purpose and the structure of the *Gesta pontificum*: the work is a history of English

[134] William of Malmesbury, *William of Malmesbury's saints' lives*, eds. and trans. M. Winterbottom & R. M. Thomson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), pp. xxi-xxii.

bishops. The differences between Eadmer and William's presentations of Anselm probably derive from the inherent dissimilarities between the *Gesta pontificum* and the *Historia*.

The section of the *Gesta pontificum* which narrates the life of Anselm is heavily dependent on Eadmer's writing, the *Historia* in particular.[135] Close comparative reading of the two texts reveals that William makes adjustments to the character of Anselm which moderate Eadmer's use of monastic themes in describing Anselm's behaviour and portray Anselm as a more active and resilient character.[136] Anselm's decision to sail to England prior to his investiture as archbishop is an important example of this. In the *Historia*, Eadmer emphasises Anselm's reluctance to come to England due to his fear of being ordained, and then explains in full how the decision to sail was eventually made. Eadmer relates that Hugh, earl of Chester had summoned Anselm, before explaining:

> For already a kind of presentiment was beginning to creep into the minds of some, and not a few were actually saying, not indeed openly but amongst themselves, that, if Anselm went to England, he would become Archbishop of Canterbury…. He… was unwilling to step foot in England lest any should suspect that he had done so for the purpose of obtaining this preferment… There were also at that time certain very pressing affairs of his own church which required Anselm's presence in England; but held back by the above-mentioned fear he was most unwilling to make the journey on that account… he received a message from the monks of Bec to the effect that, unless

[135] Rodney Thomson has shown that William was acquainted with both of Eadmer's works, and used them both in William's *Gesta pontificum* and his *Gesta regum anglorum*. William of Malmesbury, *William of Malmesbury's saints' lives*, eds. and trans. Winterbottom & Thomson, pp. xxi-xxii. The narration of Anselm's life in the *Gesta pontificum* seems to be mostly but not exclusively derived from the *Historia*, probably due to William's interest in Anselm's public life and actions as an archbishop which are mostly recounted in the *Historia*.

[136] The picture of Anselm that emerges both from the *Vita Anselmi* and the *Historia* has been interpreted by some, especially Southern, as a monastic figure: an unusually incompetent administrator, mildly mannered in character and without a head for political situations. Southern, *Biographer*, pp. 122, 125. Southern, *Portrait*, pp. 181-4, 439.

> he wished to be branded with the sin of disobedience, he was not to return to the monastery until he had crossed over to England and attended their business there.[137]

There is a very brief explanation in the *Vita Anselmi* which parallels this focus on obedience and monastic duty, summarising the reasons given in the *Historia*:

> Anselm was invited, nay urgently entreated and required to come to England by Hugh earl of Chester and many other noblemen of the English kingdom… and being moreover constrained by the prayer and command laid upon him by his own church for their common good, he came to England.[138]

In the *Vita*, Eadmer condenses his extended explanation from the *Historia*, but the emphases on command, obedience and Anselm's own reluctance remain the same. In both texts, Eadmer highlights Anselm's relationship with Bec monastery. The comment in the *Historia* that Anselm crossed over to England only when pressed by his monks also presents Anselm as acting in his capacity as an abbot.

In the *Gesta pontificum,* William also depicts Anselm as reluctant to sail, but after explaining that Anselm was frequently invited to come to England, he departs from Eadmer's focus on obedience and from the strong rejection of Anselm's interest in pastoral affairs:

> He (Anselm) was attracted by the need so many felt for him, but drawn back by fear that it might look as though he had forgotten what his good name demanded and was

[137] *HN*, pp. 28-30. Eadmer, *Historia*, pp. 27-29: Jam enim quodam quasi praesagio mentes quorumdam tangebantur, et licet clanculo nonnulli ad invicem loquebantur eum, si Angliam iret, archiepiscopum Cantuariensem fore… Angliam intrare noluit, ne se hujus rei gratia intrasse quisquam suspicaretur… exigebant etiam tune temporis ecclesiae suae quaedam valde necessariae causae ut Angliam pergeret, sed, praefato illum cohibente pavore, nullo pro eis pacto volebat iter arripere... mandatum est illi a Beccensibus, ne, si peccato inoboedientiae notari nollet, ultra monasterium repeteret, donec transito mari, suis in Anglia rebus subveniret.

[138] *VA*, II, i: Anselmus invitatus immo districta interpellatione adiuratus ab Hugone Cestrensi comite, multisque aliis Anglorum reni principibus... et insuper aecclesiae suae prece atque praecepto po communi utilitate coactus, Angliam ingressus est.

> ambitious to be archbishop. Finally, when he could put it off no longer if souls were not to be lost, he sailed to England, sacrificing to God the purity of his conscience.[139]

William then outlines various matters of church business to which Anselm seeks to attend.[140] William does not mention that the Bec monks directly ordered Anselm to sail. Despite mentioning Hugh of Chester's ailing health and his request for Anselm's presence for his confession as reasons for Anselm's decision to sail, William nowhere presents Anselm responding to this request in terms of obedience. In the *Gesta pontificum*, William omits Eadmer's explanation for Anselm's decision, and gives Anselm a motive that Eadmer directly states was not a factor in Anselm's sailing. This alteration significantly alters the appearance of Anselm's character, and shows him making a pastoral decision and already acting as a bishop. The removal of obedience as factoring in Anselm taking this office moves this account away from the more heavily Anselmian narratives in the Bec *Vitae*, some of which include obedience in the accounts of the promotions of other abbots, as discussed above.

The scene in which Anselm is coerced into accepting the position of archbishop highlights a further contrast between William's account and his source text. Eadmer's full narrative only appears in his *Historia.* In the *Vita Anselmi*, the description of Anselm's forced elevation, the king's choice, the agreement of the clergy and people, Anselm's resistance and eventual defeat, is reported in only five sentences.[141] In the *Historia*, Eadmer relates a chaotic series of actions in which, during the course of a heated debate, Anselm is physically dragged to and from the king's bedside by a group of bishops. Eadmer twice uses forms of the verb *rapere* to describe this forced movement and mentions Anselm's physical resistance to these assaults.[142] The amount of space Eadmer gives to Anselm's words, both direct and reported,

---

[139] *GPA*, p. 117: inuitabat ergo eum multorum necessitas, sed retrahebat timor, ne, femae melioris oblitus, raptari ambitione archiepiscopatus putaretur. Postremo, cum iam differre sine dispendio animarum nequiret, in Angliam nauigauit, conscientie suae puritatem Deo sacrificans.

[140] William repeats details from Eadmer's *Historia* about the need to consolidate plans for an Abbey at Chester, to visit the sick Hugh of Chester, but adds the duty of attempting to lighten the burden of taxes on Anselm's estate by interceding with the king. Eadmer complains at length about William Rufus' oppression of the Churches, but does not mention this specifically in relation to Anselm's estates or Anselm taking action over this oppression.

[141] Compare summary in the *VA*, II, i. Eadmer, *Historia*, pp. 29-37.

[142] Eadmer, *Historia*, pp. 32-33.

as they appear on the page, is considerably less than that given to his opponents.[143] The effect of this is to create a scene with a sense of hysteria wherein Anselm appears throughout to be overwhelmed, both physically and verbally.

In William's *Gesta pontificum*, as in Eadmer's narrative, Anselm is physically removed from the king's bedside by the bishops at the beginning of the scene. [144] When describing this removal, William, instead of repeating Eadmer's language uses the verb 'tulerunt'. This verb carries fewer connotations of ineffectiveness and force than does Eadmer's choice (*rapere*). William omits Eadmer's description of Anselm being dragged back to the king's bedside during the debate. Instead, he relates a scene in which Anselm confronts the bishops in a more controlled exchange: here, William affords more space to Anselm's defence than to the persuasion of his opponents.[145] Eadmer arranges the debate so that Anselm and the bishops' arguments overlap, which creates a hysterical sense of clamouring voices and argument, but William opens his account with the bishops' persuasion and then has Anselm respond in two more controlled set-pieces of speech. In his account of the debates, Eadmer uses direct speech to express the bishops' and king's arguments as well as Anselm's refusal, whereas William uses a combination of direct and indirect speech. It is notable that in the *Gesta pontificum* all direct speech is given to Anselm himself and all opposing speech is indirect, a rhetorical choice which gives Anselm's argument more force. The effect of William's alterations is to convey the impression of a debate in which Anselm appears to possess more control, both physically and verbally. In this scene, William much reduces the length of Eadmer's narrative, but there is a notable exception when the bishops finally physically assault Anselm physically and force him to take the post. At this point, William expands

[143] A comparison of words in Latin reveals that Eadmer gives Anselm one hundred and eighty-three words to defend himself, and his opponents two hundred and sixty-seven. Looking purely at space as measured by Latin words allocated, Eadmer gives Anselm around forty percent of the argument, giving a majority of the debate in the scene to Anselm's opponents.

[144] *GPA,* pp. 121-3. *Historia*, pp. 32-36.

[145] In terms of Latin words, William gives Anselm one hundred and sixty-eight words, and the bishops sixty-nine. Eadmer dedicates forty percent of the argument in terms of words in Latin to Anselm, where William gives the same character over seventy percent.

Eadmer's description, comparing the assault to that of one on an enemy and emphasising the violence involved.[146]

The differences between the ways in which these scenes are presented indicate the different interpretations, as well as narrative functions, of the event. William's account presents Anselm, first, as more effectively resisting the bishops, both physically and verbally, and secondly as a man who required a greater degree of physical force to be overpowered. Throughout William's writing, he consistently alters Anselm's character to present an ecclesiastic who differs from Eadmer's character. The Anselm from the *Historia* who often appears overwhelmed is re-written to present a figure more in control of the described events. These changes are for the most part subtle: William keeps events entirely the same, but alters Anselm's reactions.[147]

A comparison with other monk-bishops created by these two authors in their historical and hagiographical works suggests that it is William's Anselm who more closely resembles the typical character of ecclesiastic that both authors present. Eadmer's earlier accounts of Canterbury saints, such as Oda or Dunstan, balance both pastoral and monastic themes, but give far less attention to the latter than Eadmer does in his works focussing on Anselm. William's depiction of the lives of saints similarly shows figures who have the same inclination to use force and vigorous action.[148] These Canterbury ecclesiastics collectively appear as

[146] William's description of the overpowering of Anselm is similar to Eadmer's, and here they use the same verb (Eadmer- 'impellere', William – 'impellunt'). This is the one area where William seems to expand on Eadmer's much longer description of the event. *GPA*, p. 123: Donec episcopi mutuo se cohortati impetum quasi in hostem coniurant. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 35.

[147] One example of how these subtle changes work with regards to the degree of Anselm's activeness comes where William depicts Anselm as announcing his departure after the failed council of Rockingham, refusing to surrender his titles or honours, where Eadmer has him request permission to leave. In terms of the account, this means little, however in terms of Anselm's character and relationship with the king, small alterations build up to create a different image. In addition, in these reported interactions between Anselm and the English kings, William tends to omit Eadmer's depictions of Anselm as 'simple' or meek, and expands any of Eadmer's hints of Anselm's charisma. William's changes are consistent and clearly thematic, developing Anselm into a pastorally-focussed, charismatic and more stalwart figure. *GPA,* p. 139. Eadmer, *Historia*, pp. 71-2.

[148] William's own life of Dunstan presents the character in a similar way: William of Malmesbury, *William of Malmesbury's saints' lives*, eds. and trans. Winterbottom & Thomson, p. 227.

robust and vigorous figures who command absolute respect from their peers and often respond violently when kings do not fulfil their expectations.[149]

Eadmer's character of Anselm as thwarted and persecuted by the devil-like king and his villainous followers presents a very different figure from the typical Canterbury archbishop. William's re-positioning of this character turns Anselm into a man who resembles a more familiar type of ecclesiastical figure. Eadmer's Anselm did not represent the ideal monk-bishop in William's eyes, so in order to present a suitable model both for authors writing literary accounts of ecclesiastics as well as for contemporary, active members of the secular clergy, William may have felt that some modifications were necessary.

Aside from these adjustments to Eadmer's description of Anselm's character, William also makes minor additions to Eadmer's account which seem to reflect wider themes in his historical narrative. The most immediately noticeable of these additions appears directly after the Easter council at Rome in 1099, and is probably connected to contemporary developments in the Investiture Controversy. William relates that, during Anselm's journey to Lyon after attending this council, Anselm is forced to take an indirect route. The reason William provides is that Wibert, the anti-pope, had sent an artist to Rome who had painted a picture of Anselm and that this image had been circulated, which had made the direct route dangerous.[150] This detail does not appear in Eadmer's recordings, and Eadmer appears to have a rather more ambiguous attitude towards the anti-pope than does William. In the *Vita Anselmi*, Eadmer does not mention Wibert; even when discussing Roman opposition to 'the pope', he attributes this to 'their loyalty to the emperor'. Eadmer's early narration of Rufus' refusal to acknowledge Pope Urban II omits all mention of a contender to the papal throne.[151] In the *Historia*, the treatment of the papal schism becomes more ambivalent when Eadmer introduces Wibert as a contender for the papal throne as 'Clement', and initially refrains from passing judgement on Wibert. Later, he speaks of this same character as 'Wibert', a villain

[149] Many of Eadmer's other subjects react vigorously when kings do not act in the way they expect. The case of Dunstan dragging King Eadwig out of his bedroom and back into church or of Oda branding the face of the king's mistress and dispatching her to Ireland highlight that traditional ecclesiastics differed from Anselm's rather milder outlook. *VOO*, p. 28. *VD*, p. 98.

[150] *GPA*, p. 161.

[151] *VA*, II, xvi & xxxvii.

who, in alliance with the king of Germany, Henry IV, is assailing any member of the monastic order along the road to Rome, in a picture that provides a stark contrast to the early, non-judgemental introduction of 'Clement'.[152] The German emperor is identified in both of Eadmer's works as the principal inciter of trouble against Anselm and Pope Urban, with Wibert making one appearance as an ally.[153]

William creates a more cohesive picture of Wibert, clearly favouring Urban from the outset of the dispute: they are introduced as 'Urban' and 'Wibert'. This second author suggests that Wibert's support arose from fear and obligation.[154] William expands Eadmer's shorter description of Wibert's villainous behaviour and removes all references to assault by the king of Germany's men, thereby replacing Eadmer's principal villain with Wibert. William's presentation of Wibert and the king of Germany may be linked to his overall narrative of the Investiture Controversy. In the *Gesta regum*, William several times associates Wibert with violent action, explicitly referring to Wibert's 'uiolentia'.[155] William specifically identifies Wibert as the 'begetter' of the schism, commenting that throughout his life, Wibert refused to give his hand to justice and to abandon his illegitimate position. William then declares that Wibert: 'poisoned the air of heaven with his own existence'.[156]

[152] Eadmer, *Historia*, pp. 52, 94. The introduction of the papal dispute sees the two popes introduced in virtually idential ways, with Eadmer concluding by commenting that Urban was now widely recognised as pope, and as a Norman abbot, Anselm had already recognised Urban.

[153] Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 94. Eadmer explains in the *Historia* the danger that faced Anselm: 'Foremost in so doing were the King of Germany's men on account of a quarrel which in those days had arisen between him and the Pope.' (His tamen quammaxime homines Alamannici regis intendebant, ob dissentionem quae fuerat illis diebus inter papam et ipsum). *HN*, p. 98.

[154] *GPA*, p. 135. William explains that, of Germany: Guiberto necessitate subiectionis ministrabat terarum tractus qui sub imperio illius iacet, and of England: in Guibertum tamen inclinatior propter metum regis.

[155] William of Malmesbury, *Gesta regum anglorum*, eds. and trans. R. A. B Mynors, R. M. Thomson & M. Winterbottom (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), pp. 491, 593.

[156] William of Malmesbury, *Gesta regum anglorum*, eds. and trans. Mynors, Thomson & Winterbottom, p. 523: Grauabat superas adhuc uiuendo Wibertus auras, unicus scismatis sator, nec umquam quoad uixit peruicatiam deposuit, ut iustitiae manus daret, imperatoris iuditium pronuntians sequendum, non lanistarum uel pellificum Romanorum.

The first version of William's *Gesta pontificum* was completed around the middle of 1125, soon after the Concordat of Worms in 1122, in which papal and imperial differences were settled for a generation.[157] In the *Gesta regum*, William identifies the antipopes, and in particular Wibert, as the primary drivers behind the dispute between the empire and papacy. The vilification of these individuals then allows William to firmly take the papal side in the investiture controversy, but still minimise his criticism of the German emperors. After the passage wherein William identifies Wibert as the originator of the schism, William details his and Henry IV's excommunication, but then includes a character portrait of Henry IV as a good emperor, with qualities of intelligence, charity, justness and a warrior-like nature.[158] Henry IV's son, King Henry V of Germany, was also Henry I of England's son-in-law. William presents Henry V as afflicted by stubbornness and as the inheritor of his father's dispute and its consequences. After the Concordat and the resolution, William praises Henry as the equal to Charlemagne in terms of his devotion and then moves to comment on the Empress Matilda's virtue.[159]

Since the anti-pope is frequently characterised as an evil and unjust figure across William's works, the appearance of Wibert as the principal villain in William's account of Anselm's travels reflects William's presentation of the characters in the Investiture Controversy. William criticises Henry V's youth and stubborn nature, but identifies the anti-popes as the malevolent figures in the dispute. This narrative decision could reflect both William's plea for support from Matilda, the former wife of the German emperor, and William's retrospective position, writing after Henry V came to a resolution with the Pope.

This chapter has investigated how Anselm's posthumous memory was approached in two separate groups of texts. The Bec *Vitae* were written in a similar circumstance as

[157] William narrates the events of the Concordat of Worms in his *Gesta regum anglorum*: William of Malmesbury, *Gesta regum Anglorum*, eds. and trans. Mynors, Thomson & Winterbottom, pp. 763-783. This compromise, signed September 23rd, 1122 by Pope Calixtus II and Henry V was a major event in the Investiture Controversy, marking the end of the first phase of the dispute. For the significance of the Concordat, see: U. Blumenthal, *The investiture controversy: Church and Monarchy from the Ninth to the Twelfth Century* (Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991), pp. 167-174.

[158] William of Malmesbury, *Gesta regum anglorum*, eds. and trans. Mynors, Thomson & Winterbottom, p. 523.

[159] William of Malmesbury, *Gesta regum anglorum*, eds. and trans. Mynors, Thomson & Winterbottom, p. 783.

Eadmer's own *Vita Anselmi* and *Historia*. This group of texts commemorates monastic leaders, composed by authors positioned within the inner confines of the Bec-Canterbury circle. The Bec authors' incorporation of Anselmian themes are often taken from Eadmer's texts, and tend to emphasise the pre-eminence of monastic and ecclesiastical authority over secular powers. They were further used to model the behaviour of monastic figures. By contrast, William's moderation of Eadmer's themes reflects the overall purpose of the *Gesta pontificum*, and William's position as slightly removed from the Bec-Canterbury circle. William's tempering of monastic themes in favour of presenting Anselm as an ecclesiastical character reveals the significance of a text's overall structure and intention to an author's treatment of Anselmian themes.

Conclusion

The argument presented in this thesis has implications for the study of monastic culture, the Bec-Canterbury circle, Anselm, but perhaps particularly for Eadmer. This was a period of anxiety about the proper form of the monastic life, in which the creation of good role models was of the utmost importance. In particular, Bec monastery was a reforming house with a strict adherence to the Rule of St. Benedict. After the Norman Conquest, the movement of monks from Bec to Christ Church, Canterbury seems to have led to Canterbury adopting a similar ethos. The incorporation of Anselmian themes into the characters and narratives may reflect wider contemporary anxieties regarding monastic identity. All the authors considered above were monks from Benedictine backgrounds. Across this period, monastic reforms were being enacted at a number of different levels; by 1140, there were many alternative models for monastic life, from the Cistercians to the Carthusians, and from the Grandmontines to the Vallumbrosans.[1] Although Benedictine monasticism grew steadily between 1050 and 1150, there were contemporary criticisms concerning declining numbers and lax observation 65at Benedictine monasteries.[2] The figure of Anselm, and his texts, were, at least for part of these communities, a focal point for a general assertion of the excellence of the Benedictine monastic life, and a degree of modernisation of the vision of the perfect monk and abbot.

One of the principal themes in this thesis is the potential of systematic theology to influence the writing of history and hagiography, even when still in its earliest phases. The appearance of Anselmian themes in these texts may give insight into the method of authors writing in the genres of history and hagiography, and their willingness to include contemporary ideas from entirely separate genres, such as theology. In particular, the first two books of the Eadmer's *Historia novorum in Anglia* describe both the world and recent events in theological terms. There is considerable debate surrounding the existence of

[1] See particularly, J. van Engen, 'The "Crisis of Coenobitism" Reconsidered: Benedictine Monasticism in the Years 1050-1150', *Speculum* 61:2 (1986) pp. 269-304.

[2] For example, Orderic Vitalis, a black monk himself, reported Robert of Molesme's complains about lax observation - Orderic Vitalis, *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, ed. and trans. M. Chibnall, 6 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969-80), vol. 8, p. 312.

boundaries between genres such as history in the medieval era, with many scholars arguing that history in this period existed only as a subsidiary genre, only relevant as the compositions related to the revelation of sacred scripture.[3] The research presented in this thesis may further highlight the nature of monastic writing as being part of meditative monastic studies, where distinctions of genre may have been flexible.

The texts examined in this thesis present a case study of wider developments that were occurring in this period, both in intellectual culture and society. Particular themes appear throughout this study, such as the tensions between monastic and episcopal models of behaviour, and between monastic, episcopal and secular authorities. The occurrence of particular monastic themes, such as strong reluctance to promotion, may distinctly demonstrate the intrusion of monastic values into contemporary expectations of the behaviour of the secular clergy. However, there appears to be a corresponding resistance to this trend, perhaps best exemplified by William of Malmesbury's moderation of Eadmer's monastic themes. These cases may reveal the contemporary divergence of opinion regarding these social developments, and disagreement even within exclusively monastic circles.

More specifically, this thesis has presented a new analysis of Eadmer as an author, and of Eadmer's texts. Chapters one, two and three highlighted the structured and organised nature of this author's works, and the consistency of attention given to contemporary debates and events. Eadmer has often been seen as a simplistic and unsophisticated scholar. This evaluation may be true to a point, as Eadmer was no great theologian. However, a more nuanced understanding of this author and his texts may aid other scholars working in this area. Eadmer's texts are the primary source for the events of William Rufus' reign and for Anselm's life, and as such, are of the foremost significance. The research in this study may underline Eadmer's approach to the genres he was working within, and importance of theological themes and contemporary debates to his texts. On a smaller but related note, this thesis may show Anselm's depth of influence on Osbern,

[3] B. Smalley, *Historians in the Middle Ages* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1974), pp. 15-25 & R. Vaughan, 'The Past in the Middle Ages', *Journal of Medieval History* 12:1 (1986), pp. 1-14, at. p. 11.

which may highlight Osbern's place in this network, despite this author's relatively small output of texts.

The incorporation of Anselmian themes into texts produced at the Bec and Canterbury communities by multiple authors demonstrates Anselm's dominance within this specific network. Even other significant leaders such as Lanfranc were recast in their own hagiographical texts according to Anselm's character and habits. The ascendency of Anselm's teachings may have been accelerated by the dissemination of Eadmer's *Vita Anselmi*, but it is noteworthy that Anselmian themes appear in Osbern's *Vita Alfege*, which predates Eadmer's works.[4] The extent of Anselm's influence reinforces the notion that his work was considered revolutionary and that he had considerable personal ability to recruit followers.[5] In particular, Anselm's ideas underpin the foundation of Eadmer's works, and their presence in texts which were unrelated to Anselm may highlight the degree of his influence on Eadmer.

Further, this thesis has highlighted the extent to which Anselm's legacy has depended upon Eadmer and his works. Eadmer's *Vita Anselmi* had a reasonably wide circulation, and formed the cornerstone of the near-contemporary legacy of Anselm. Eadmer's *Vita Anselmi* appears to have been accepted by the community at Bec monastery; the later Bec *Vitae* make use of Eadmer's *Vita Anselmi*. Although Eadmer's characterisation of Anselm in the *Historia* was moderated by William of Malmesbury in the *Gesta pontificum*, this account retains a great deal of Eadmer's original themes. Eadmer's interpretations of Anselm's life and teaching appear to have been widely accepted by contemporaries.

It is notable that the authors in this study were clearly engaging with contemporary theological texts and themes. Gilbert Crispin and William of Malmesbury developed reputations as theologians of some note. Eadmer's theological efforts however, have not earned praise and Osbern and Milo Crispin wrote no theology which survived. Despite this, most of these individuals understood Anselm's thought to the extent that they attempted to represent these themes in their historical and hagiographical texts.

[4] Osbern's earliest text, the *Vita S. Alfege*, is dated to c.1080.

[5] See discussion of Anselm's personal role in recruitment by Southern. Southern, *Portrait*, p. 184.

The research in this thesis supports recent scholarly work which has sought to re-evaluate medieval authors' claims of writing in order to edify their readers.[6] The presence of Anselm's ideas in contemporary historical and hagiographical texts suggests that the authors examined in this study were deeply concerned with accurately presenting good models of human behaviour. These authors were willing to distort events and characters to ensure that their texts were in line with contemporary notions of human behaviour and the world. This inclination suggests that achieving historical accuracy may have been of secondary importance to the presentation of ideal models. Some historians have particularly criticised Eadmer and Osbern for failing to record events accurately: Osbern's *Vita Alfege* has been dismissed as lacking hard information and Eadmer has been accused of creating 'false history'.[7] These criticisms may reflect the fundamental disconnect between the modern and medieval expectations of the purpose and value of historical texts.

The reason for an author's explicit interest in creating *exempla* is stated openly in some of these texts. Osbern and Eadmer both explained that they expected to receive a reward if their compositions provided readers with some benefit. Osbern writes in the *Preface* to the *Vita Alfege*:

> No one will find fault with me then, if I steer clear of the danger of this verdict and publish all I know about Alfege, glorious martyr of Christ, for others to know too. If I speak truly and my audience listens to advantage, providence will reward us with the bounty of its repayment so that I need not regret the hard work I put into my narration nor they the interest they pay to it.[8]

[6] See: S. Sønnesyn, *William of Malmesbury and the Ethics of History* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2012).

[7] *Vita Alfege*, p. 22. Southern, *Biographer*, p. 281.

[8] *Vita Alfege*, p. 25. Osbern, *VA*, p. 122: nequaquam mihi succensendum esse existimo; si huius sententiae periculum devitans, ea quae de glorioso Christi Martyre Elphego ipse agnovi, aliis quoque agnoscenda proponam. Erit autem providentiae & me veraciter dicentem & illos salubriter audientes ita retributionis suae benefico donare; ut neque me laboriosae aliquantulum narrationis, neque illos usurariae poeniteat operationis.

Eadmer makes a similar comment in the *Preface* to the *Historia*. In this second case, Eadmer explains that his contemporaries were looking into the doings of their predecessors, seeking 'a source of comfort and strength'. Eadmer continues:[9]

> I cannot doubt that those who have composed such records, provided that they have laboured with a good motive, will receive from God a good reward.[10]

Osbern and Eadmer's explicit mention of this expectation of gaining a spiritual reward follows Anselm's teaching that if an agent moves others to God through their actions (in Anselm's explanation, this is primarily achieved through conversation or demonstrations of love), that agent would receive a reward from God.[11] Anselm repeatedly asserted that his only interest in loving or interacting with other people was because of God, and the potential for his own movement towards God through other people.[12] The principal motivation of these authors, most of whom were working under Anselm's guidance, may have been the expectation of a similar benefit through inciting their readers towards good works. Modern historians may labour for financial rewards or for social recognition, but medieval historians appear to have been motivated by spiritual currency and recognition from God.[13]

The differing intention of these medieval authors is highlighted by Milo Crispin's comments in the *Preface* to the Bec *Vitae Abbatum*. Milo explains that although men of old

---

[9] *HN*, p. 1. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 1: cupientes videlicet in eis unde se consolentur et muniant invenire.

[10] *HN*, p. 1. Eadmer, *Historia*, p. 1: quos nimirum si bono quidem zelo in huiusmodi desudarunt, bonam exinde mercedem recepturos a Deo crediderim.

[11] This is most explicit in Eadmer's report of Anselm's preaching in the *Vita Anselmi*, where Eadmer writes: Moreover, if from this service I grow in love towards you, this also will be added to the sum of your reward, that you have done something which had produced so much good in me. And if I do not grow in love, your love nevertheless remains with you, while the service you had paid me passes from me utterly. *VA*, I, xxix: Adhaec si ex ipso officio circa vos aliquid charitatis in me crevit, et hoc ipsum vobis ad cumulum retributionis erit, qui fecistis unde mihi tantum bonum provenit. Si non vobis tamen charitas vestra remansit, a me officium quod exhibuistis penitus transit.

[12] Anselm, *Proslogion*, 25. Anselm, *Oratio pro amicis*.

[13] This is emphasised by Osbern's comparison of his position with the parable of the talents in the opening to this *Preface*.

had recorded the deeds of their ancestors to 'perpetuate the memory of themselves and their subjects as long as possible' and win 'everlasting praise', his own aim was different:[14]

> Let the descendants regard and follow the footprints of their ancestors, so that without stumbling they can run the life of salvation with the steps of good work towards glory and the prize of God's heavenly calling.[15]

Inevitably, where a straightforward description of actual events might lead a reader away from this straight path to salvation, minor distortions may have been necessary to effect good models. Therefore, the incorporation of contemporary conceptions of appropriate human behaviour and the world in these texts may represent the foremost interest of a monastic writer to 'earn his pay' by encouraging good works in others, rather than reflecting a simple partisan interest or a deliberate attempt to 'distort' history.

This interpretation may initially appear to be complicated by these authors' frequent claims that their texts were absolutely truthful.[16] Assertions of truthfulness may have been intended to create more inspiring *exempla*, thereby deepening a reader's belief in God and his saints, and reaping more rewards for the fortunate author. Eadmer's inclusion of the Canterbury forgeries in book five of the *Historia* reflects this likely focus on beneficial results, rather than any genuine anxiety about accuracy.[17] Modern scholars often rely on the accuracy of Eadmer's 'eye-witness accounts' when reconstructing the events of William Rufus and Henry I's reigns. This thesis has sought to demonstrate that Eadmer, and other associated monks, transformed actual episodes into theological lessons to guide his readers, lessons which drew heavily from Anselm's theological and meditational thought.

---

[14] S. N. Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec and the Anglo-Norman state 1034-1136* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1981), p. 67. Milo Crispin, 'Vitae Abbatum' in Migne, *PL*, vol. 150, CL, 695: hoc modo sibi et iis quos scribere suscipiebant, praesentem quam maxime memoriam efficerent longam, laudemque, ut putabant, mererentur perennem.

[15] Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec and the Anglo-Norman state 1034-1136*, p. 67. 'Vitae Abbatum' in Migne, *PL*, CL, 695: et minors vestigia majorum quae sequi debeant aspicientes, sine offensione passibus boni operis currant viam salutis ad gloriam et ad bravium supernae vocationis Dei.

[16] See: Osbern, *VA*, p. 122. *VA*, II, lxxi.

[17] Eadmer, *Historia*, pp. 261-276.

Bibliography: Primary Sources

Adelard, 'Vita Dunstani', in *Memorials of Saint Dunstan, archbishop of Canterbury*, Rolls Series, vol. 63, ed. W. Stubbs (London: Longman, 1874), pp. 53-68.

Anon, 'Annales Beccenses' ed. A. A. Poree in *Chronique du Francois Carre* (Rouen: C. Meétŕie, 1883), pp. 1-11.

Anon, *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: a Collaborative Edition*, vol. 7. MS E, ed. S. Irvine (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2002)

Anon, *Three Treatises from Bec on the Nature of Monastic Life*, ed. G. Constable and trans. B. S. Smith (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008)

Anon, *Vita Edwardi Regis qui apud Westmonasterium requiescit*, ed. and trans. F. Barlow (London: Nelson, 1962)

Anselm of Canterbury, *S. Anselmi cantuariensis archiepiscopi opera omnia*, 6 vols, ed. F. S. Schmitt (Edinburgh: Nelson, 1946–1961)

Augustine of Hippo, *De civitate Dei,* Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, vol. 47, eds. B. Dombart & A. Kalb (Turnhout: Brepols, 1955)

Augustine of Hippo, *De civitate Dei,* Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, vol. 48, eds. B. Dombart & A. Kalb (Turnhout: Brepols, 1955)

Augustine of Hippo, *S. Aureli Augustini Hipponiensis Episcopi Epistulae*, ed. A. Goldbacher, 5 vols (Vienna: Tempsky, 1911)

Augustine of Hippo, *Expositions on Psalms*, ed. P. Schaff and trans. J. E. Tweed (Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1888)

Augustine of Hippo, *De trinitate*, Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, vol. 62, eds. W. J. Mountain & F. Glorie (Turnout: Brepols, 1968)

Author 'B', 'Vita Dunstani', in *Memorials of Saint Dunstan, archbishop of Canterbury*, Rolls Series, vol. 63, ed. W. Stubbs (London: Longman, 1874), pp. 3-52.

Bede, *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, eds. B. Colgrave & R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972)

St. Benedict, *Benedict's Rule*, ed. and trans. T. G. Kardong (Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1996)

Eadmer of Canterbury, 'De reliquiis S. Audoeni', ed. A. Wilmart, *Revue des sciences religieuses* 15 (1935), pp. 302-70.

Eadmer of Canterbury, *Eadmeri Historia novorum in Anglia et opuscula duo de vita Sancti Anselmi et quibusdam miraculis ejus*, Rolls Series, vol. 81, ed. M. Rule (London: Longman, 1884)

Eadmer of Canterbury, *Vita Anselmi*, ed. and trans. R. W. Southern (London: Nelson, 1962)

Eadmer of Canterbury, 'Vita Bregwine' ed. B. W. Scholtz in 'Eadmer's life of Bregwine, archbishop of Canterbury, 761-764', *Traditio* 22 (1966), pp. 127-48.

Eadmer of Canterbury, *Lives and Miracles of Saints Oda, Dunstan and Oswald,* eds. and trans. A. J. Turner & B. J. Muir (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006)

Eadmer of Canterbury, *Vita Wilfridi*, eds. and trans. A. J. Turner & B. J. Muir (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1998)

Fridegoda, 'Vita Sancti Wilfridi' in *The Historians of the Church of York and its archbishops*, ed. J. Raine (London: Longman, 1879-94), vol 1, pp. 105-160.

Gilbert Crispin, *Gilbert Crispin Abbot of Westminster: A study of the Abbey under Norman Rule*, ed. J. Armitage Robinson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911)

Gilbert Crispin, *The Works of Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster*, eds. A. Sapir Abulafia and G. R. Evans (London: British Academy, 1986)

Goscelin of Saint-Bertin, *The hagiography of the female saints of Ely*, ed. and trans. R. C. Love (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004)

Gregory the Great, *Regula pastoralis*, eds. F. Rommel & R. W. Clement (Turnout: Brepols, 2010)

Herman the Archdeacon and Goscelin of Saint-Bertin, *Miracles of St Edmund*, ed. and trans. T. Licence (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014)

John of Worchester, *The Chronicle of John of Worchester,* eds. R. R. Darlington & P. McGurk and trans. J. Bray & P. McGurk, 3 vols. (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1995-1998)

Lanfranc of Canterbury, *Lanfranci cantuariensis archiepiscopi opera omnia,* ed. L. D'Archery (Paris: Ioannis Billaine, 1648)

Lanfranc of Canterbury, *The letters of Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury*, eds. and trans. H. Clover & M. Gibson (Oxford**:** Clarendon Press, 1979)

Milo Crispin, 'Vitae Abbatum' in *Patrologiae Cursus Completus Latina*, Series Latina, ed. J. P. Migne (Paris: Imprimerie Catholique, 1841-55), vol. 150, CL, 695.

Milo Crispin/Anon, 'Vita Bosonis' in *Patrologiae Cursus Completus Latina*, Series Latina, ed. J. P. Migne (Paris: Imprimerie Catholique, 1841-55), vol. 150, CL, 723-32.

Milo Crispin/Anon, 'Vita Lanfanci', ed. M. Gibson in *Lanfranco di Pavia e L'Europa del secondo XI*, ed. G. d'Onofrio (Rome: Italia Sacra LI, 1995), pp. 661-715.

Milo Crispin/Anon, 'Vita Letardi' in *Patrologiae Cursus Completus Latina*, Series Latina, ed. J. P. Migne (Paris: Imprimerie Catholique, 1841-55), vol. 150, CL, 756-6.

Milo Crispin/Anon, 'Vita Theobaldi' in *Patrologiae Cursus Completus Latina*, Series Latina, ed. J. P. Migne (Paris: Imprimerie Catholique, 1841-55), vol. 150, CL, 733-34.

Milo Crispin/Anon, 'Vita Willelmi' in *Patrologiae Cursus Completus Latina*, Series Latina, ed. J. P. Migne (Paris: Imprimerie Catholique, 1841-55), vol. 150, CL, 713-24.

Orderic Vitalis, *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, ed. and trans. M. Chibnall, 6 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969-80)

Osbern of Canterbury, 'Vita Alfege' in *Anglia sacra, sive Collectio historiarum, partim antiquitus, partim recenter scriptarum, de archiepiscopis & episcopis Angliae, a prima fidei Christianae susceptione ad annum MDXL,* ed. H. Wharton (London: Gregg Publishing, 1691), vol. 2, pp. 122-147.

Osbern of Canterbury, 'Vita Dunstani' in *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs (London: Longman, 1874), pp. 69-161.

Ralph of Battle, *The Chronicle of Battle Abbey*, ed. and trans. E. Searle (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980)

Robert of Torigni, *Chronique de Robert de Torigni: Abbe du Mont-Saint-Michel*, ed. L. Delisle, 2 vols. (Rouen: Le Brument, 1872-73)

Stephanus, *The Life of Bishop Wilfrid*, ed. and trans. B. Colgrave (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007)

Symeon of Durham, *Libellus de exordio atque procursuistius hoc est Dunhelmensis, ecclesie*, ed. and trans. D.W. Rollason (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000)

Symeon of Durham, *Symeonis monachi opera omnia: volume 1: historiae ecclesiae dunhelmensis*, ed. T. Arnold (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012)

Symeon of Durham, *Symeonis monachi opera omnia: volume 2: historia regum*, ed. T. Arnold (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012)

Various, *Three eleventh-century Anglo-Latin saints' lives: Vita S. Birini, Vita et miracula S. Kenelmi, and Vita S. Rumwoldi*, ed. and trans. R. C. Love (Oxford: Clarendon Press/New York: Oxford University Press, 1996)

William of Malmesbury, *El Libro De Laudibus et Miraculis Sactae Mariae de Guillermo de Malmesbury*, ed. J. M. Canel (Rome: Edizioni 'Ephem. Mariol, 1968)

William of Malmesbury, *Gesta pontificum Anglorum: the history of the English bishops*, ed. and trans. M. Winterbottom (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007)

William of Malmesbury, *Gesta regum Anglorum*, ed. W. Stubbs (London: Eyre and Spottiswooode, 1887)

William of Malmesbury, *Gesta regum Anglorum: the History of the English kings*, eds. and trans. R. A. B. Mynors, R. M. Thomson & M. Winterbottom (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998)

William of Malmesbury, *Historia Novella*, ed. E. King & trans. K. R. Potter (London: Nelson, 1955)

William of Malmesbury, *Vita Wulfstani*, ed. R. R. Darlington (London: Offices of the Society, 1928)

William of Malmesbury, *William of Malmesbury's saints' lives*, eds. and trans. M. Winterbottom & R. M. Thomson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002)

Bibliography: Translations

Anselm of Canterbury, *Complete Philosophical and theological treaties of Anselm of Canterbury*, trans. J. Hopkins & H. Richardson (Minneapolis: The Arthur J. Banning Press, 2000)

Anselm of Canterbury, *The letters of Saint Anselm of Canterbury*, 3 vols., trans. W. Fröhlich (Kalamazoo, Michigan: Cistercian Publications, 1990-4)

Anselm of Canterbury, *The prayers and meditations of Saint Anselm with the Proslogion*, trans. B. Ward (Suffolk: Penguin Books, 1973)

Augustine of Hippo, *City of God*, trans. H. Bettenson (London: Penguin Classics, 2003)

Augustine of Hippo, *The Works of Augustine: A translation for the 21st century* (New York: New City Press, 2004)

Eadmer of Canterbury, *History of Recent Events in England*, trans. Geoffrey Bosanquet (London: Cresset Press, 1964)

Gregory the Great, *Pastoral Care*, trans. H. Davis (Newman Press: New York, 1950)

Osbern of Canterbury, *The life of Alfege*, trans. F. Shaw (London: St. Paul's Publishing, 1999)

Various, *The Abbey of Bec and the Anglo-Norman state 1034-1136*, trans. S. N. Vaughn (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1981)

Bibliography: Secondary Sources

A. Sapir Abulafia, 'An attempt by Gilbert Crispin, abbot of Westminster at a rational argument in the Jewish-Christian debate', *Studia Monastica* vol. xxvi (1984), pp. 55-74.

A. Sapir Abulafia, 'Jewish-Christian disputations and the twelfth-century renaissance', *Journal of Medieval History* 15:2 (1989), pp. 105-125.

W. Aird, 'Orderic's Secular Rulers and Representations of Personality and Power in the *Historia ecclesiastica,*' in *Orderic Vitalis: life, works and interpretations*, eds. C. C. Rozier, D. Roach, G. E. M. Gasper & E. M. C. van Houts (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2016), pp. 189-216.

W. Aird, 'The Political Context of Symeon's *Libellus de exordio*' in *Symeon: Historian of Durham and the North*, ed. D. W. Rollason (Stamford: Shaun Tyas, 1998), pp. 32-45.

E. Albu, *The Normans in their histories: propaganda, myth and subversion* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2001)

L. Ashe, *The Oxford English Literary History. Volume 1: 1000-1300: conquest and transformation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017)

F. Barlow, *Edward the Confessor* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1997)

F. Barlow, *The English Church, 1066-1154: A History of the Anglo-Norman Church* (London: Longman, 1979)

F. Barlow, *William Rufus* (London: Methuen, 1983)

J. Barrow, *The clergy in the medieval world: secular clerics, their families and careers in north-western Europe, c. 800-1200* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015)

M. Baxandall, *Patterns of Intention: On the historical explanation of Pictures* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1985)

D. J. Bernstein, 'The Blinding of Harold and the Meaning of the Bayeux Tapestry', *Anglo-Norman Studies* 5 (1982), pp. 40-64.

H. Bloom, *The Anxiety of Poetry: A Theory of Poetry* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997)

U. Blumenthal, *The investiture controversy: Church and Monarchy from the Ninth to the Twelfth Century* (Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991)

M. Brett, *The English Church under Henry I* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975)

N. P. Brooks, 'The Authority and Interpretation of the Bayeux Tapestry', *Anglo-Norman Studies* 1 (1978), pp. 1-34.

T. Callahan, 'The making of a monster: the historical image of William Rufus', *Journal of Medieval History* 7:2 (1981), pp. 175-195.

M. D. Chenu, *Nature, man and society in the twelfth century: essays on new theological perspectives in the Latin West* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997)

M. Chibnall, *The Debate on the Norman Conquest* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999)

J. B. Clayton, *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History* (Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1991)

L. Cleaver, 'The monastic library at Le Bec' in *A companion to the abbey of Le Bec in the central middle ages (11th-13th centuries)*, eds. B. Pohl & L. L. Gathagan (Boston: Brill, 2018), pp. 171-206.

M. L. Colish, *The mirror of language: A study in the medieval theory of knowledge* (Lincoln: The University of Nebraska Press, 1953)

A. Collins, *Teacher in Faith and Virtue: Lanfranc of Bec's commentary on St. Paul* (Leiden: Brill, 2007)

H. Cowdrey, *Lanfranc: scholar, monk, Archbishop* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003)

J. C. Crick & E. M. C. van Houts, *A Social History of England, 900-1200* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011)

P. Damian-Grint, *The New Historians of the twelfth-century Renaissance: Inventing Vernacular Authority* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1999)

R. H. C. Davis, *A history of Medieval Europe* (New York: Longman Group Limited, 1970)

D. C. Douglas, *William the Conqueror* (Berkley: University of California Press, 1992)

M. M. Enani & M. S. Farid, *The Comparative Tone; Essays in Comparative Literature with Special Reference to English Studies in Egypt, Translation and Culture* (Cario, State Publishing House, 1995)

J. van Engen, 'The "Crisis of Coenobitism" Reconsidered: Benedictine Monasticism in the Years 1050-1150', *Speculum* 61:2 (1986), pp. 269-304.

G. R. Evans, Anselm's life, works and immediate influence' in *The Cambridge Companion to Anselm*, eds. B. Davies and B. Leftow (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 5-31.

M. Evans, *The death of kings: Royal deaths in medieval England* (London/New York: Hambledon and London, 2003)

K. A. Fenton, *Gender, Nation and Conquest in the Works of William of Malmesbury* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2008)

V. I. J. Flint, 'The Sources of the 'Elucidarius' of Honorius Augustodunensis,' *Revue Benedictine* 85 (1975), pp. 190-98.

W. Fröhlich, 'Anselm's *Weltbild* as conveyed in his letters', *Anselm Studies* 2 (1988), pp. 483-525.

R. Gameson, *The Earliest Books of Canterbury Cathedral: Manuscripts and Fragments to c. 1200* (London: The Bibliographical Society and The British Library, 2008)

R. Gameson, *The Manuscripts of Early Norman England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999)

George Garnett, *Conquered England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007)

G. E. M. Gasper, 'A doctor in the house'? The context for Anselm of Canterbury's interest in medicine with reference to a probable case of malaria', *Journal of Medieval History* 30 (2004), pp. 245-261.

G. E. M. Gasper, *Anselm of Canterbury and his theological inheritance* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004)

G. E. M. Gasper, 'Economy distorted, economy restored: order, Economy and Salvation in Anglo-Norman monastic writing', *Anglo-Norman Studies* 38 (2015), pp. 51-65.

G. E. M. Gasper, 'Envy, Jealoisy and the Boundaries of Orthodoxy: Anselm, Eadmer and the Genesis of the Proslogion', *Viator* 41 (2010), pp. 45-68.

G. E. M. Gasper, 'Money and its use in the thought and experience of Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury (1093–1109)', *Journal of medieval history* 38:2 (2012), pp. 155-182.

G. E. M. Gasper, 'Theology at Le Bec' in *A companion to the abbey of Le Bec in the central middle ages (11th-13th centuries)*, eds. B. Pohl & L. L. Gathagan (Boston: Brill, 2018), pp. 206-227.

J. Gauss, 'Anselm von Canterbury. Zur Begegnung aud Auseinandersetzung der Religionem', *Saeculum* 17 (1966), pp. 277-363.

V. Gazeau, *Normannia monastica (Xe-XIIe siècle)* (Caen: Crahm, 2007)

M. Gibson, 'History at Bec in the twelfth century' in *The Writing of History in the middle ages: essays presented to Richard William Southern*, eds. R. H. C Davis & J. M. Wallace (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981), pp. 167-186.

M. Gibson, *Lanfranc of Bec* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978)

J. Gillingham, *William II: The Red King* (London: Allen Lane, 2015)

C. Giraud, *Per verba magistri. Anselme de Laon et son ecole au XII siècle* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010)

C. Given-Wilson, *Chronicles: the writing of history in Medieval England* (London: Hambledon Continuum, 2004)

B. Goebel, *Im Umkreis von Anselm: Biographisch-bibliographische Porträts von Autoren aus Le Bec und Canterbury* (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 2017)

B. Goebel, S. Niskanen & S. Sønneyson, *Ralph von Battle: Dialoge zur philosophischen Theologie* (Feiburg: Verlag Herder, 2015)

M. Goullet, *Écriture et réécriture hagiographiques. Essai sur les réécritures de Vies de saints dans l'Occident latin médiéval (VIIIe-XIIIe s.)* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005)

M. Goullet, 'Vers une typologie des réécritures hagiographiques, à partir de quelques exemples du Nord-Est de la France', in *La réécriture hagiographique dans l'Occident Médiéval. Transformations formelles et idéologiques*, eds. M. Goullet and M. Heinzelmann, (Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2003)

A. Graham, *Intertextuality* (London: Routledge, 2000)

A. Gransden, *Historical Writing in England: 550-1307* (London: Routledge, 1974)

M. Gullick, 'The Hand of Symeon of Durham: further reflections on the Durham Martyrology Scribe' in *Symeon of Durham: Historian of Durham and the North*, ed. D.W. Rollason (Stamford: Shaun Tyas, 1998)

C. Harper-Bill, 'Herluin, Abbot of Bec and his Biographer', *Studies in Church History* XV (1978), pp. 15-25.

C. Harper-Bill, 'The Anglo-Norman Church' in *A companion to the Anglo-Norman World* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2002), pp. 165-190.

C. Hart, 'The Bayeux Tapestry and schools of illumination at Canterbury', *Anglo-Norman Studies* 22 (1999), pp. 117-167.

J. Haseldine, 'Love, Separation and Male Friendship: Words and Actions in Saint Anselm's Letters to his Friends' in *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, ed. D. M. Hadley (London: Longman, 1999), pp. 238-256.

P. Hayward, 'An absent father: Eadmer, Goscelin and the cult of St. Peter, the first abbot of St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury', *Journal of Medieval History* 29:3 (2003), pp. 201-218.

P. Hayward, 'Gregory the Great as "Apostle of the English" in Post-Conquest Canterbury', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 1:55, pp. 19-57.

P. Hayward, 'Sanctity and Lordship in Twelfth-century England: Saint Albans, Durham, and the cult of Saint Oswine, King and Martyr' *Viator* 30, pp. 105-144.

P. Hayward, ‘St Wilfrid Ripon and the Northern Church in Anglo-Norman Historiography’, *Northern History* 49 (2012), pp. 11-35.

P. Hayward, ‘The Importance of Being Ambiguous: Innuendo and Legerdemain in William of Malmesbury's Gesta regum and Gesta pontificum Anglorum’, *Anglo-Norman Studies* 33 (2010), pp. 75-102.

G. Hermeren, *Influence in Art and Literature* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005)

D. Hogg, *Anselm of Canterbury: The Beauty of Theology* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2004)

W. Hollister, *Henry I* (London: Yale University Press, 2001)

J. Hopkins, *Hermeneutical and Textual problems in the Complete Treatises of St. Anselm* (Toronto/New York: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1976)

E. M. C. van Houts, ‘Historical Writing’ in *A companion to the Anglo-Norman World,* eds. C. Harper-Bill and E. M. C. van Houts (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2002)

E. M. C. van Houts, ‘The Memory of 1066 of 1066 in Written and Oral Traditions’, *Anglo-Norman Studies* 19 (1997), pp. 167-79.

E. M. C. van Houts, *The Normans in Europe* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000)

T. D. Hughes, ‘Odo of Tournai, Scholar and Holy man’, unpublished DPhil thesis (University of Oxford, 2000)

K. Ihnat, *Mother of Mary, Bane of the Jews: Devotion to the Virgin Mary in Anglo-Norman England* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016)

J. Kristeva, ‘Le mot, le dialogue et le Roman’ in *Sēmeiōtikē: Recherches pour une sémanalyse* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1969), pp. 143-173.

J. Leclercq, *The love of learning and the desire for God: a study of monastic culture*, trans. C. Misrahi (New York: Fordham University Press, 1982)

T. Licence, ‘Goscelin of Saint-Bertin and the hagiography of St Eadwold of Cerne’, *Journal of Medieval Latin* 16 (2007), pp. 182-207.

R. C. Love, 'Goscelin of Saint-Bertin', in *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999)

J. Lowden, *Under the influence: the concept of influence and the study of illuminated manuscripts*, eds. J. Lowden & A. Bovey (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007)

D. E. Luscombe*, '*Bec, Christ Church and the correspondence of St Anselm', *Anglo-Norman Studies* 18 (1995), pp. 1-17.

R. A. Markus*, Saeculum: History and society in the theology of St. Augustine* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970)

G. Martin & R. M. Thomson, 'History and History books', in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain vol. 2: 1100-1400*, eds. R. M. Thomson & N. J. Morgan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 400-415.

E. Mégier, 'Jesus Christ, a Protagonist of Anglo-Norman History? History and Theology in Orderic Vitalis's *Historia ecclesiastica*', in *Orderic Vitalis: life, works and interpretations*, eds. C. C. Rozier, D. Roach, G. E. M. Gasper & E. M. C. van Houts (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2016), pp. 260-283.

E. Mason, 'William Rufus: myth and reality', *Journal of Medieval History* 3:1 (1977), pp. 1-20.

E. Mason, *William Rufus: The Red King* (Stroud: Tempus, 2005)

H. Mayr-Harting, *Religion, politics and society in Britain, 1066-1272* (Harlow: Longman, 2011)

B. P. McGuire, *Friendship and Community: The Monastic Experience, 350-1250* (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1988)

R. R. Mundill, *The King's Jews: Money, Massacre and Exodus in Medieval England* (London: Continuum, 2010)

A. Murray, *Suicide in the middle ages: volume 2: the Curse on Self-Murder* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998)

S. K. Niskanen, *The Letter Collections of Anselm of Canterbury*, Ph.D diss (Helsinki, 2009)

S. K. Niskanen, *The Letter Collections of Anselm of Canterbury* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011)

G. Nortier, *Les bibliothèques médiévales des abbayes bénédictines de Normandie* (Caen: Bibliothèque d'histoire et d'archeologie chretiennes, 1966)

J. van Oort, 'The end is now: Augustine on History and Eschatology', *Theological Studies* 68 (2012), pp. 1-7.

M. Otter, '1066: the moment of transition in two narratives of the Norman Conquest', *Speculum* 74:3, pp. 565-86.

A. Owen Aldridge, 'The Concept of Influence in Comparative Literature: A Symposium', *Comparative Literature Studies*, Special Advance Number (1963), pp. 143-152.

S. Ridyard, 'Condigna veneratio: post-Conquest attitudes to the saints of the Anglo-Saxons', *Anglo-Norman Studies* 9 (1987), pp. 179–206.

D. Robertson, *Lectio divina: the medieval experience of reading* (Trappist, Ky. : Cistercian Publications, 2011)

C. C. Rozier, 'Symeon of Durham as Cantor and Historian at Durham Cathedral Priory, c.1090-1129' in *Medieval Cantors and their Craft: Music, Liturgy and the Shaping of History* eds. K. A. Bugyis, A. Kraebel and M. E. Fassler (York: York Medieval Press, 2016), pp. 190-206.

J. Rubenstein, 'Biography and Autobiography in the Middle Ages', in *Writing Medieval History*, ed. N. Partner (2005), pp. 53-69.

J. Rubenstein, 'Liturgy against History: The Competing visions of Lanfranc and Eadmer of Canterbury', *Speculum* 74:2 (1999), pp. 279-309.

J. Rubenstein, 'The life and writings of Osbern of Canterbury', in *Canterbury and the Norman Conquest: Churches, Saints and Scholars, 1066-1109,* eds. R Eales & R. Sharpe (London: The Hambledon Press, 1995)

F. S. Schmitt, 'Die unter Anselm veranstaltete Ausgabe seiner Werke und Briefe: die Codices Bodley 271 und Lambeth 59,' *Scriptorum* 9 (1955), pp. 64-75.

B. Smalley, *Historians in the middle ages* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1974)

K. A. Smith, *War and the Making of Medieval Monastic Culture* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2013)

S. Sønnesyn, '*Studiosi abdita investigant'*: Orderic Vitalis and the Mystical Morals of History' in *Orderic Vitalis: life, works and interpretations*, eds. C. C. Rozier, D. Roach, G. E. M. Gasper & E. M. C. van Houts (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2016)

S. Sønnesyn, *William of Malmesbury and the Ethics of History* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2012)

R. W. Southern, 'Aspects of the European Tradition of Historical Writing, 4: The Sense of the Past', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 5:23 (1973), pp. 243-63.

R. W. Southern, 'Canterbury Forgeries,' *English Historical Review* 63:287 (1958), pp. 193-226.

R. W. Southern, *Medieval Humanism and Other Studies* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1970)

R. W. Southern, *Scholastic Humanism and the Unification of Europe,* vol. 1 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1995)

R. W. Southern, *Saint Anselm and his Biographer: a study of monastic life and thought, c.1059- c.1130* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963)

R. W. Southern, *Saint Anselm: A portrait in a landscape* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990)

R. W. Southern, 'Sally Vaughn's Anselm: Examination of the foundations', *Albion* 20:2 (1988), pp. 181-204.

R. W. Southern, 'St. Anselm and Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster,' *Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 3 (1954), pp. 78-115.

R. W. Southern, 'St. Anselm and his English pupils,' *Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 1 (1941), pp. 3-34.

E. Sweeney, *Anselm of Canterbury and the desire for the word* (Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2012)

E. Z. Tabuteau, *Transfers of Property in Eleventh-century Norman Law* (Carolina: University of Carolina Press, 1988)

H. M. Thomas, *The secular clergy in England, 1066-1216* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014)

R. M. Thomson, *Books and Learning in twelfth-century England: the ending of alter orbis* (Hertfordshire: Red Gull Press, 2006)

R. M. Thomson, *William of Malmesbury* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1987)

A. Vauchez, *La sainteté en Occident aux derniers siècles du Moyen Age : d'après les procès de canonisation et les documents hagiographiques* (Rome: Ecole française de Rome/Paris: Diffusion de Boccard, 1981)

R. Vaughan, 'The Past in the Middle Ages', *Journal of Medieval History* 12:1 (1986), pp. 1-14.

S. N. Vaughn, 'Anselm in Italy', *Anglo-Norman Studies* 16 (1993), pp. 245-70.

S. N. Vaughn, *Anselm of Bec and Robert of Meulan: The Innocence of the Dove and the Wisdom of the Serpent* (California: University of California Press, 1992)

S. N. Vaughn, 'Anselm of Le Bec and Canterbury: Teacher by Word and Example, Following the Footprints of His Ancestors' in *A companion to the abbey of Le Bec in the central middle ages (11th-13th centuries)*, eds. B. Pohl & L. L. Gathagan (Boston: Brill, 2018), pp. 57-93.

S. N. Vaughn, 'Anselm: Saint and Statesman', *Albion* 20:2 (1988), pp. 205-220.

S. N. Vaughn, 'Among these authors are the men of Bec: historical writing among the monks of Bec' in *Essays in Medieval Studies* 17 (2000), pp. 1-18.

S. N. Vaughn, *Archbishop Anselm 1093-1109: Bec Missionary, Canterbury Primate, Patriarch of Another World* (Oxford: Ashgate Publishing, 2012)

S. N. Vaughn, 'Eadmer's *Historia Novorum*: A Reinterpretation', *Anglo-Norman Studies* 10 (1987), pp. 259-289.

S. N. Vaughn, 'Saint Anselm and His Students Writing about Love: A Theological Foundation for the Rise of Romantic Love in Europe', *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 19:1 (2010), pp. 54-73.

S. N. Vaughn, *St. Anselm and the Handmaidens of God: A study of Anselm's Correspondence with Women* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002)

S. N. Vaughn, 'The Students of Bec in England' in *Saint Anselm of Canterbury and His Legacy* ed. G. E. M. Gasper (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 2012), pp. 73-91.

C. Walker Bynum, *Jesus as mother: studies in the spirituality of the High Middle Ages* (Berkley: University of California Press, 1982)

T. Webber, 'Monastic and Cathedral Book Collections in the late eleventh and twelfth centuries', in *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland*, ed. Peter Hoare, vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006)

B. Weiler, 'Kingship, Usurpation and Propaganda in Twelfth-Century Europe: the Case of Stephen', *Anglo-Norman Studies* 23 (2001), pp. 299-326.

B. Weiler, 'William of Malmesbury, Henry I, and the Gesta Regum Anglorum', *Anglo-Norman Studies* 31 (2009), pp. 157-76.

B. Weiler, 'William of Malmesbury on Kingship', *History* 90 (2005), pp. 3-22.